JPRS 78109

19 May 1981

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1136

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

JPRS 78109

19 May 1981

USSR REPORT

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1136

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL

U.S., NATO Militaristic Policies Undermine Detente
(A. Nikonov, R. Faramazyan; MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, Feb 81) 1

Deepening Economic, Political Crisis of Capitalist System Described
(I. Gur'yev; MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, Feb 81) 14

Analysis of Turkey's Current Domestic, Foreign Policies
(Aleksandr Viktorovich Filippov, Vladimir Borisovich Kudelin, ZA RUBEZHOM, 10-16 Apr 81) 26

REGIONAL

Ukrainian Rural Construction Minister on Branch's Progress, Problems
(Yu. Kotov; RADYANS'KA UKRAYINA, 12 Apr 81) 35

Report on 8th Congress of Ukrainian Writers Union
(PRAVDA UKRAINY, 9 Apr 81) 40

Shcherbitskiy Address
Problems Highlighted

U.S., NATO MILITARISTIC POLICIES UNDERMINE DETENTE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 2, Feb 81 (signed to press 4 Feb 81) pp 47-59

[Article by A. Nikonov and R. Faramazyan: "Dangerous Policy of Heating Up Military Tension"]

[Text] Detente has been transformed into the leading trend in the development of international relations in the 1970's, on the basis of fundamental changes in the balance of forces in the world arena in favor of peace and socialism and thanks to the purposeful activity of the Soviet Union first of all, the socialist community and other progresive forces, and also realistic representatives of the ruling circles of the capitalist countries. After more than two decades of "cold war" unleashed by imperialist reaction, real prospects for finally removing the heavy burden of the arms race, reducing the threat of thermonuclear war, and applying all their resources and energy to creative labor in the name of peace and the social progress of humanity have opened up to the peoples of the globe.

The process of detente has been marked by positive shifts in the strengthening of international security, in developing mutually advantageous cooperation among states with different social structures. Important landmarks along this path have been changes for the better in Soviet-American relations, normalization of the political situation in Europe, the success of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which was crowned with the unanimous adoption by 35 states of a Final Document, a kind of charter of international life based on recognition of the necessity for peaceful coexistence.

During those same 1970's, promising bilateral and multilateral steps were taken to limit the arms race and lower the level of military confrontation. In the area of Soviet-American relations, special note should be taken of the signing in May 1972 of the "Agreement to Limit Anti-Missile Defense Systems" and the "Temporary Agreement on Certain Measures in the Area of Limiting Strategic Offensive Weapons," the Soviet-American "Agreement on Preventing Nuclear War" (June 1973) and the achievement of other Soviet-American agreements of a military-political nature which have been aimed at reducing military danger.

We could also point to such fundamentally important multilateral agreements as the "Agreement on Prohibiting the Deployment of Nuclear Arms and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and Ocean Floor and Beneath Them" (February 1971), the "Convention Prohibiting the Development, Production and Stocking of Bacteriological

(Biological) and Toxic Weapons and Their Destruction" (April 1972) and the "Convention Prohibiting Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Means of Influencing the Environment" (May 1977). These documents, together with the "Agreement to Stop the Spread of Nuclear Weapons" signed in 1968 and the "Agreement on the Principles of State Research on and Use of Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies" (January 1967) have formed a whole system of international agreements which have cleared the way to curtailing the arms race, to real disarmament.

Successful development of detente and its initial tangible fruit could not but have gladdened many millions of people of our planet who are vitally interested in international security and strengthening peace.

However, all this in no way gladdened reactionary imperialist forces who strove in every way possible during those years to oppose the development of realistic trends in U.S. and other NATO-country foreign policies, who did not cease to undermine political, and especially military, detente. As the 1970's became the 1980's, these forces shifted to a direct counter-offensive against detente, peace and the rights of peoples, which has led to a serious deterioration in the whole international situation.

This turn of events was not unexpected. The USSR and other countries of the socialist community have repeatedly warned -- and subsequently been proven right -- that there would be high and low tides in the policy of detente, that peace could be reliably ensured only in a stubborn struggle between a policy of disarmament, strengthening peace and ridding humanity of the threat of thermonuclear war, on the one hand, and a policy of urging on the arms race, "balancing on the edge" of such a war for the sake of preserving and strengthening the weakening positions of imperialism in the world, on the other.

Their forming a political bloc with Peking hegemonists has played a considerable role in intensifying aggressive tendencies in the foreign policies of the ruling circles of the USA and other NATO countries. The Chinese leaders' break with the principles of Marxism-Leninism and their chauvinist foreign policy course permeated with anti-Sovietism, their persistent sabotaging of international agreements on limiting the arms race, their open support of the most reactionary regimes, including the fascist Pinochet regime in Chili, their military and other assistance to all sorts of schisms in the national liberation movement and, finally, their direct military aggression against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam -- all this has been for the imperialist forces an additional incentive to switch to a counter-attack on detente.

By supercharging international tension, by hindering detente and whipping up the arms race, imperialist reaction would like to substantially retard the economic development and improvement in the well-being of the peoples of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community and, in so doing, weaken the attraction of socialism and the degree of its influence on international relations. Of course, such calculations and hopes of the enemies of socialism have more than once now been turned into the grossest errors and most bitter disappointments. However, as we see, they have still not changed their shortsighted policies and are unwilling to draw realistic conclusions from historical experience.

Certain imperialist circles are frightened by the prospect of concluding new and more effective disarmament agreements and other military detente measures with the

Soviet Union. It is inconvenient for them that, given detente in the military area, the myth of a so-called "Soviet military threat," fear of which has for many decades been an integral element in both the foreign and domestic policies of imperialism, would unavoidably be increasingly dispelled. The demand that this myth be used has become especially sharp given the general economic and political instability of capitalism, the growing struggle of workers in the capitalist countries for their rights and interests.

The fact that adding military detente to political detente might restrict even more their opportunities for armed resistance to progressive social changes in the world, which are occurring in particular in the course of the historically natural national liberation anti-imperialist struggle of peoples for their own freedom and independence, is also inconvenient for the aggressive circles of imperialism.

Militaristic and military-industrial circles have played and continue to play an enormous role in current imperialist policy. This applies especially to the ruling spheres of the USA. Their hostile approach to detente as a whole and to military detente in particular results foremost from an organic unwillingness to accept the very fact that strategic equilibrium has evolved between the USSR and the USA, from a striving to change it in favor of Washington by any means. Hence, their negative attitude towards the principle of equality and the identical security of the parties as a fundamental principle of all practical steps involving detente in the military area, including Soviet-American talks and agreements on limiting strategic arms. It is therefore by no means accidental that one of the central objectives of the attacks made during the course of the noisy propaganda campaign which has unfolded in the USA has been precisely the Soviet-American SALT-2 Agreement based on that principle.

The calculations by some U.S. ruling circles that, in an atmosphere of international tension, it would be easier for them to preserve their leading position in the capitalist world than under detente have also been of not inconsiderable importance. They are afraid that deepening detente will weaken the bonds of "Atlantic solidarity." The persistent striving by Washington to bind its NATO allies more tightly to itself using long-term programs of increasing military preparations is very indicative of that.

Of course, a considerable share of the responsibility for retarding detente and heating up international tension also lies with the ruling circles of other NATO countries, which have largely been solid backers of their transoceanic partners. However, the level of that solidarity and its practical influence on the foreign policies of each of these countries are unique. They depend on the internal political situation, geostrategic position, and also on a complex interweaving of many other factors determining both the nature of the interest of a particular country in continuing detente and the level of its participation in the anti-detente campaign.

The shift of the ruling circles of the USA and a number of other imperialist countries to the counter-attack against detente signifies a serious change in their foreign policies towards intensifying aggressiveness and adventurism. By placing their main reliance on military might as the primary means of achieving their goals, such policies have come to acquire an increasingly militaristic character. In this regard, nonmilitary factors of force -- economic, ideological and others -- are being evaluated by the governing bodies of the USA and NATO foremost from the viewpoint of

the possibility of their maximum use to weaken the economic and morale-political components of the defense potential of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries.

Quite naturally, militarization of the foreign-policy course of ruling circles of the USA and other NATO countries could not but be adequately reflected in their military-political thinking, their military strategy, thus confirming the truth of one of the fundamental theses of military science, that the interrelationships between military strategy and politics are in the end built on the principle of the former being completely dependent on the latter. A logical consequence of the intensified aggressiveness and adventurism of U.S. foreign policy in the late 1970's was President Carter's proclamation of equally aggressive and adventuristic military-strategic concepts and aims.

Proceeding from the precise delimitation, accepted in Soviet military science, of such concepts as military doctrine, military strategy and military-strategic concepts, we can state that Carter's military-strategic "innovations" do not go beyond the framework of U.S. state military doctrine which has evolved and been in effect, with certain modifications, throughout the post-war period. Without altering the essence of that military doctrine, they make certain adjustments in U.S. military strategy to attach an even more aggressive character to it and bring it into conformity with the tasks of a counter-offensive against detente, with a policy of changing the military balance at global and regional levels in favor of imperialism. All these new concepts are unified by a single common idea, making nuclear war an "acceptable" means of achieving the foreign-policy goals of American imperialism, expanding the spectrum of international-political situations in which ordinary and nuclear military force could be used with the least risk to one's self.

The concept of "limited nuclear war" embodied in the famous Directive No 59 signed by President J. Carter in July 1980 is especially dangerous. At least two other directives are directly affiliated with it: No 58, on steps to protect the civilian and military leadership of the USA in case of nuclear war, and No 53, which concerns preserving and providing means of control in such a war.

It is quite obvious that, from the moment they came to light, the new White House directives have signified a conscious orientation towards whipping up the arms race, foisting it off on other countries, and retarding if not disrupting the entire detente process. The political content of Directive No 59 and those accompanying it testify to a cynical contempt for the most important Soviet-American documents of the early 1970's, to which three U.S. presidents affixed their signatures. Let us recall that the Soviet-American communique on the results of the highest-level Geneva meeting of 15-18 June 1979 states: "Each party states that it is not striving and will not strive for military superiority, inasmuch as that can only lead to dangerous instability, by generating a higher level of armament, which will not ensure the security of either of the parties."[1]

It might be added that the claim of military superiority over the Soviet Union which is the basis of the military-strategic concepts left President R. Reagan by the J. Carter administration is absolutely incompatible with the principle of equality and

---

1. "Radi mira na zemle. Sovetsko-amerikanskaya vstrecha na vysshem urovne v Vene 15-18 iyunya 1979 goda. Dokumenty, rechi, materialy" [For Peace on Earth. Highest-Level Soviet-American Geneva Meeting of 15-18 June 1979. Documents, Speeches, Materials], Moscow, 1979, p 61.

identical security of the parties, on which all Soviet-American talks and agreements in the military-political area, including SALT-1 and SALT-2, have been based.

The Carter "limited nuclear war" plan arose by no means out of thin air. The root of Directive No 59, the idea that it is possible to wage a "limited," "controlled" nuclear war, is not something fundamentally new to the military-strategic thinking of the ruling circles of the USA. This idea was also present in the "flexible response" strategy and in a modified version of that strategy, "realistic deterrent," and in the concepts advanced in the 1960's and 1970's by then secretaries of defense R. MacNamara and J. Schlessinger.

At the same time, this version contains new elements which make it especially dangerous and reckless. Anticipating a nuclear first strike by the USA, not only at military and industrial targets, but also at the military-political control centers of a probable enemy, Directive No 59 has in mind not simply an arithmetic increase in the number of possible targets, but the acquisition by the United States of the capability of paralyzing responses by the other party, forcing it to capitulate. In other words, the Carter "model," unlike any of its predecessors, counts on the possibility of achieving a decisive victory using "limited" nuclear war. In this regard, reliance is placed not only on improving the methods of waging such a war by the United Stated, but also the creation of corresponding new military technical means. Directive No 59 seems to "program" a forced whipping up of the nuclear missile arms race, foremost along the lines of continued qualitative improvement in such arms.

In describing the true meaning of Directive No 59, L. I. Brezhnev noted: "Its primary essence in fact reduces to making the idea of nuclear was somehow acceptable to public opinion. That is the purpose of discussing what is called 'limited,' 'partial' use of nuclear weapons, which has nothing to do with reality and only deceives the people. A policy extremely dangerous to all the peoples of the world! It is hard even to imagine that it comes from the government of a country which signed an agreement with the Soviet Union on preventing nuclear war."[1]

Apologists for "limited nuclear war" consciously avoid the fundamental question: are there and can there be any reliable guarantees whatsoever that a "limited" nuclear war will not grow into a worldwide thermonuclear catastrophe? There are no such guarantees, nor can there be. That alone is enough to view Directive No 59 as playing with fire, as an example of irresponsible disdain for the fate of humanity, including the fate of the American people. It follows even from the approximate estimates by American experts that not less than 140 million Americans would die and 75 percent of the country's economic potential would be destroyed in a nuclear war if it came to the USA.

Official approval of the "limited nuclear war" concept at a NATO nuclear planning group meeting in late 1980 and its acceptance as a principle of strategic planning for the entire North Atlantic bloc testifies to the fact that the governments of the states comprising it are assuming the role of accomplices of U.S. aggressive circles, and in so doing, an enormous responsibility to the peoples of their own countries.

Acceptance of the "limited nuclear war" concept and admitting the possibility of waging such a war in Western Europe regardless of whether the governments of Western European NATO member-nations want one or not can have the most tragic consequences

---

1. PRAVDA, 20 August 1980.

for those countries. We cannot ignore the fact that one of the basic goals of the Carter concept is to wage a "limited" nuclear war on the land of other states, including NATO allies, and, in so doing, to avoid a retaliation strike at the USA itself. It is quite obvious that, in this instance, a "limited" nuclear war would be total in nature for the Western European states and could lead to their total physical destruction.

The decision made at the Brussels NATO council session in December 1979 to deploy American medium-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe corresponds in significant measure to the ideas and aims of Carter's Directive No 59.

At the military-technical level, the appearance of the very idea of deploying qualitatively new medium-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe was closely connected with the program for creating new weapons systems of that type -- cruise missiles and Pershing-2 ballistic missiles, as well as with the decision made back in 1975 to "modernize" NATO nuclear potential.

That fact deserves special attention, for all the subsequent noisy propaganda campaign undertaken to justify the deployment of American medium-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe was and continues to be built on the thoroughly false thesis that such deployment is a response to Soviet missiles called SS-20's in NATO terminology. In this connection, it is to the point to recall that almost immediately after the 1974 Vladivostok SALT-2 talks, the American side began, under various far-fetched pretexts, to avoid including cruise missiles with a range of over 600 km in "ceilings" just agreed to with the Soviet side, which was one of the serious causes of the SALT-2 talks being stretched out for nearly five years.

This circumstance clearly demonstrated that the American side associated the creation and deployment of medium-range cruise missiles and their exclusion from the "ceilings" agreed to in Vladivostok with their own hopes of evading the fundamental principle of equality and identical security in order to obtain a military-strategic advantage over the Soviet Union. In the course of subsequent talks, the USA, as is known, agreed to include in the levels agreed to only air-based cruise missiles (deployed on strategic bombers). But concerning surface and sea-based cruise missiles, Washington wanted to simply delay deploying them until after 31 December 1981, that is, only for the period the SALT-2 Agreement Protocol would be in effect. The true reason for this position was revealed in the Brussels NATO decision. The real state of affairs was the same -- an effort to subvert the detente process, to upset the strategic equilibrium in favor of the USA and NATO, and to achieve for them military superiority over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact Organization.

The Brussels decision's purpose was a very substantial disruption of the entire Soviet-American strategic balance. If deployed in Western Europe, the 572 American medium-range nuclear weapons -- 464 Tomahawk cruise missiles and 108 Pershing-2 ballistic missiles --would be able to reach the Soviet Union, while medium-range Soviet missiles, including the SS-20, would be unable to reach the USA. Thus, from the viewpoint of the security of the Soviet Union, the deployment of American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe would make them not operational-tactical weapons, but strategic weapons, which would violate the quantitative "ceilings" set for the strategic weapons of both parties by the SALT-2 Agreement in favor of the USA. For the Soviet Union, the levels would have remained as before -- 2,400 and 2,250, while for the USA, they would actually have increased to 2,972 and 2,822, respectively.

But that is only the quantitative side of the matter. Its qualitative side is no less important. By being located near the borders of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries, American "Eurostrategic" missiles would be first-strike weapons. In this regard, it is especially important to note that the flight time of Pershing-2 missiles to targets on Soviet territory would be only about four minutes. And that itself would give the USA very substantial strategic advantages, changing the strategic situation on both regional-European and global levels appreciably in its favor.

In other words, the Brussels decision was oriented towards obtaining quantitative and qualitative superiority over the USSR in the area of strategic weapons and is, for this reason, a very gross violation of the principle of the equality and identical security of the parties.

The so-called "Carter Doctrine" occupies an appreciable place among the military-political concepts advanced in connection with the shift by U.S ruling circles to the counter-offensive against detente. Its main provisions were put forward in concentrated form in a speech by the U.S. president at the Council of Industrialists (in December 1979), in the "State of the Union" message to Congress in January 1980, in a 23 January 1980 address at a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives, and in speeches by his closest assistants, Assistant for National Security Z. Brzezinski and Secretary of Defense G. Brown.

All the content of the "doctrine" is openly aggressive and hegemonistic in nature, permeated through and through with the intention of imposing its will on other states and peoples, placing disposal of their natural resources at its discretion, shamelessly flouting their sovereign rights, interfering in their internal affairs, inciting armed conflicts and using military force where and when Washington's politicians and strategists think it necessary. The heart of the "Carter Doctrine" is its declared -- in violation of the UN Charter and generally recognized norms of international law -- inclusion of an overwhelming majority of the regions of the globe among the "vital interests" of the USA -- Europe and the South Atlantic, Latin America and Africa, the Far East, Southern and Southeastern Asia, the Near and Middle East.

Under the false pretext of defending their "vital interests," American ruling circles have unfolded broad-scale militarist preparations. One manifestation of this is the decision to create special "rapid deployment forces" whose specific purpose is to conduct punitive operations and other military adventures in regions many thousands of kilometers from the United States. It is very significant that this very concept was born in the USA long before the events in Iran and Afghanistan, which J. Carter used to justify the "doctrine" he advanced.

The sources of this idea can be found in the declarations made in the heat of the 1973-1974 energy crisis by then Secretary of State H. Kissinger and Secretary of Defense J. Schlessinger, who proved the "necessity" of increasing the American military presence in the Near and Middle East. Z. Brzezinski subsequently assumed the task of theoretically substantiating such a presence not only in that region, but also in other regions of the world. In December 1978, he publicly advanced the concept of U.S. "strategic responsibility" for the state of affairs in a so-called "arc of instability," in which he arbitrarily included a number of countries of East Africa (Kenya, Somalia, Ethiopia), Southwest and Southeast Asia (Oman, South Yemen, Turkey, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Malasia, Singapore) and Australia.

The concept of U.S. "strategic responsibility" was concretized in late 1978 in a report, "Military Alternatives in the Persian Gulf," prepared on instructions from Secretary of Defense C. Brown. It directly points out the necessity of forming highly mobile troop units intended to operate in that region and it outlined steps to create weapons and ammunition stockpiles in Saudi Arabia and other petroleum-extracting countries of the southern Persian Gulf, Egypt and Israel, stockpiles which could be used by the Pentagon if necessary.

Soon after the "Carter Doctrine" was proclaimed, the beginning of the formation of "rapid deployment forces" was officially declared. Lt Gen P. Kelly was named their commander. According to initial government preliminary plans, they were to number 100,000 personnel, but that was then increased to 200,000 or more marines, airborne troops and navy personnel.

The composition of the new military formation and its material and technical supply were planned by the Pentagon for military operations in any region of the world without reinforcements or resupply for 60 days. According to presidential memorandum No 51, Lt Gen P. Kelly was instructed to be ready to use nuclear weapons in the Near East.

At the same time, J. Carter's administration began a massive concentration of naval forces and marines and aviation units attached to them in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean. After concentrating upwards of 40 warships there, including several aircraft carriers with planes carrying nuclear weapons, the USA has significantly aggravated what was already a very explosive situation in the region and has intensified the overall tension in the world.

J. Carter, Z. Brzezinski, C. Brown and a number of other officials of the last administration made considerable efforts to draw NATO allies into joint participation in militaristic actions in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean. In answering Washington's summons, the British conservative government officially supported the basic provisions of the "Carter Doctrine" and expressed its intention to revive the British military presence "east of the Suez." In turn, certain FRG officials, foremost the leaders of parties of the right, declared it necessary to "broaden the tasks" of the Bundeswehr and also the possibility of using West German naval forces in Persian Gulf operations. France, without approving U.S. actions in that region, still has strengthened its military presence in the Indian Ocean.

The dangerous military-strategic concepts and the practical steps taken by the USA and other NATO countries based on them at the global and regional levels have increased political and military tension in the world and are undermining international security.

In the final analysis, the new aggressive tendencies in U.S. and NATO foreign policy and military strategy are also determining the primary directions of military preparations and the quantitative levels and qualitative status of the armed forces and weapons of the North Atlantic bloc, which clearly exceed defense needs and are clearly offensive in nature.

Active material preparations for war have led to a situation in which NATO b' . expenditures have reached unprecedented amounts. In the late 1970's and early 1980's, NATO countries began a new stage in intensifying military preparations. The long-range military program through 1993 adopted in May 1978 at a NATO Council session in

Washington anticipates the implementation of a whole complex of concrete measures aimed at further increasing the aggregate military might of NATO. This is the largest program of military preparations, in scope, in the entire history of that bloc. In the words of those who drew it up, it "marks a new era for NATO by placing the defense plans of the alliance on a more long-term foundation."[1]

A series of measures has been worked out in detail along the following main lines: increasing the overall combat readiness of the armed forces, modernizing and strengthening Western European theater nuclear forces, increasing the mobility of the armed forces and the mobilization readiness of the reserve, strengthening the navy and antiaircraft defense, improving communications systems and troop material-technical supply, creating newer means of waging radio-electronic war, and making the entire system of military preparations more efficient.

With a view towards implementing the measures outlined, they plan to spend enormous sums. The NATO Council session mentioned decided on an annual increase in military expenditures of three percent in real terms (that is, taking inflation into account) by all bloc participants. Based on such an annual increment, NATO total military expenditures will be increased from $222 billion in 1979 to $265 billion in 1985 and will exceed $300 billion in 1990.

The facts bear out that the U.S. military budget will grow even faster in the years ahead. According to the five-year program for developing the American Armed Forces in 1981-1985, annual rates of real increment in military expenditures of 4-5 percent are anticipated for that period. The policies of the administration of newly elected President R. Reagan answer the question of what the actual dynamics of growth in military expenditures will be in the years ahead. W. Van Clive, his advisor on military policy, stated that the president might insist on increasing military expenditures by more than seven percent per year in real terms.[2] That would naturally lead to a substantial intensification of the arms race in the USA, with all the consequences stemming from that.

The USA is not only forcing the arms race itself, but is also strongly spurring its partners on to do the same. Particular pressure is being put on those Western European countries for which it will be very hard to carry out the decision on an annual three-percent increase in military expenditures, due to the economic difficulties they are experiencing and for other reasons.

The military programs inherited by R. Reagan from the preceding administration largely determine the size of future military budgets and the scope and tempo of U.S. and NATO military preparations. The large-scale, technically complex programs are aimed first of all at qualitative improvement in weapons, with the extensive use of scientific and technical achievements for military purposes. And that will lead to the creation of even more destructive weapons types and systems, and each new generation will, experience shows, be considerably more expensive than the preceding.

Such work has achieved its greatest scope in the USA. According to official data, in the mid-1980's, the total cost of just 46 programs to develop large weapons systems

---

1. NATO REVIEW, No 4, 1978, p 30.

2. See: DEFENSE INDUSTRY REPORT, 17 November 1980, p 443.

is estimated to be more than $260 billion.[1] Ever-increasing amounts are being directed into carrying out strategic nuclear missile weapons programs. Much attention is being paid to developing the underground MX mobile missile system. The plan is to deploy 200 such missiles. Of the total amount proposed for this system, estimated to be more than $33 billion, $10 billion will be expenditures on developing and producing the missiles themselves and upwards of $23 billion will be for building a fundamentally new complex for the mobile subsurface "Racetrack," which will consist of 4,600 protected shelters.

The Pentagon continues to spend huge sums on the sea-based Trident nuclear missile system. Its overall cost is estimated to be $28.8 billion by mid-1980.[2] In late 1979, the first nuclear submarine re-equipped with Trident-1 missiles, the Lafayette, joined the fleet. In August 1981, the lead nuclear submarine with Trident-1 missiles, the Trident, is to begin operating. In 1981-1985, the plan is to arm six such submarines with these missiles, and three each in each of the following two years. The Pentagon initially planned to purchase 13 nuclear submarines with Trident-1 missiles. Moreover, Trident-1 missiles are to be deployed in place of Poseidon missiles on 12 Lafayette nuclear submarines in 1980-82.[3] At the same time, development of the Trident-2 continues, series production to begin in the late 1980's.

A program to modify the B-52 to carry cruise missiles is in the implementation stage. The plan is to deploy approximately 3,400 strategic cruise missiles on 173 B-52 carrier aircraft by 1990.[4] Taking modernization of these bombers into account, direct capital expenditures on the program are estimated at $5.3 billion.[5] Development of a new type of strategic bomber has begun, with the intention of arming it with supersonic cruise missiles.

Preparations to develop ground-based cruise and Pershing-2 missiles are proceeding apace, those missiles to be deployed in Western European NATO countries. Total expenditures on those programs will be approximately $3.9 billion.

Substantial modernization and up-dating of nuclear warheads themselves is planned for the 1980's. Production lines have been expanded for manufacturing and assembling type W-78, W-76 and W-80 nuclear warheads. New 200-kiloton W-80 nuclear warheads will be made available to strategic aviation, as will B-43, B-61 and B-77 modified nuclear bombs of several hundred kilotons.

Re-equipping the Armed Forces with new types of conventional weapons will be accelerated. In order to increase the strike power of tactical aviation, the Pentagon is taking significant steps to modernize and increase the number of aircraft, in particular by releasing new F-15 fighters (at a total program cost estimated at $14.2 billion), F-16's ($18.8 billion), F-18's ($29.7 billion) and the direct-support A-10 ($6.0 billion).[6]

---

1. See: Ibid., 15 November 1980, p 361.
2. See: Ibid., p 362.
3. See: AEROSPACE DAILY, Vol 102, No 7, 11 March 1980, p 50.
4. See: Ibid., Vol 98, No 10, 16 June 1979, p 79.
5. See: DEFENSE INDUSTRY REPORT, 15 September 1980, pp 362-363.
6. Ibidem.

Much importance is being attached to re-equipping the navy in long-range plans. Thus, whereas the "sliding" five-year 1980-1984 program planned requests to Congress for $38.8 billion to build 67 naval combat and other ships, the 1981-1985 program projects a figure of $[illegible].1 billion to build 97 combat and other ships.

The production of new armored equipment is being expanded. The Pentagon has accelerated its acceptance of the main combat tank, the XM-1. Whereas the initial plan proposed purchasing 3,325 such tanks, it was decided in 1978 to purchase upwards of 7,000 (for a total of more than $13 billion). The plan is to expand production of artillery and other conventional weapons.

Substantial steps are also being undertaken to force the arms race in Western European NATO countries. The FRG offers a clear example of the recent trend observed in bloc countries towards substantially increasing military expenditures. According to data from the International Strategic Research Institute of London, FRG military expenditures have increased from $16.1 billion in 1975 to $25.1 billion in 1980. The FRG, which is second to the USA in terms of NATO military expenditures, has recently begun implementing a broad program of modernizing and strengthening all its armed forces and plans to spend enormous sums on developing and producing the latest types of arms and military equipment. In 1976, Bonn adopted a long-term program to re-equip the Bundeswehr with new weapons systems, the program to be completed in 1986. They plan to spend more than 50 billion marks on carrying it out.[1] Production of the new Leopard-2 tank, 1,800 of which will be provided the Bundeswehr prior to 1986, is continuing. The total cost of the program is 6.5 billion marks. A new Leopard-3 tank (FRG - France) is in the development stage. These same countries are jointly developing a "tank of the 1990's," already subsidized by three billion francs.[2] The FRG government is directing significant resources into rearming its own armed forces with new combat aircraft (Tornado, Alphajet and others), ships, artillery and other new military equipment.

The Bundeswehr will become the main NATO strike force in Europe. Nearly 80 percent of the arms and military equipment it receives comes from West German military concerns. Upwards of 5,000 enterprises and companies, not counting small concerns, participate in FRG military production. The Federal Military Equipment Department concludes about 30,000 contracts each year on arms production, worth a total of 10-12 billion marks. Some 120 institutions of higher learning, more than 70 scientific research institutes and 60 industrial development scientific centers work in the Bundeswehr. Nearly half the funds being allocated from the state budget for scientific research are being directed into developing military equipment.

In Britain, military preparations increased sharply when the Conservative government headed by M. Thatcher came to power; it adopted a policy of increasing military expenditures and accelerating the arms race, especially in nuclear weapons. Great Britain's military budget has increased from 6.9 billion pounds sterling in 1978/79 to 10.8 billion in the 1980/81 fiscal year.[3]

---

1. See: DIE WELT, 30 September 1977.

2. Ibid., 17 February 1980.

3. See: "Defence in the 1980's. Statement on the Defence Estimates 1980," Vol II, London, 1980, p 20.

Great Britain was one of the first countries in NATO to assume an obligation to deploy American medium-range nuclear weapons on its territory. In 1980, the Thatcher government adopted a new arms "build-up" plan which anticipated equipping British nuclear submarines with American Trident-1 missiles, which will increase the strike potential of Britain's nuclear forces several-fold. It plans to build four or five new nuclear submarines, which will cost at least five billion pounds sterling. The question of creating neutron weapons is being examined. In mid-1980, it declared Britain's intention to re-equip the British Rhine Army with new Challenger tanks (500-600 of them) and new types of armored transports (up to 2,000 vehicles). Delivery of the tanks will begin in 1984. The production of other types of conventional weapons is being speeded up.

In accordance with the six-year plan for re-equipping the armed forces (1977-1982), the absolute and relative scales of increment in the military might of France are increasing steadily. Particular attention is being paid to further importing and strengthening its nuclear potential through the development of second- and third-generation ground-to-ground ballistic missiles, by accepting a new mobile missile of this class for deployment after 1990, by re-equipping the first five nuclear missile submarines with new M-20 ballistic missiles with thermonuclear warheads of one megaton each, and after 1985, with multiple-warhead M-4's. It proposes putting a sixth (and qualitatively new) submarine into operation in 1985, the Enflexible, to be equipped with multiple-warhead M-4 missiles with a range of upwards of 4,000 km. It also plans to modernize its nuclear Mirage IV A bombers.

The plan is to continue equipping French armed forces with tactical nuclear weapons, as well as to develop neutron weapons. According to official data published on 18 October 1980 in Le Monde, total French expenditures on nuclear arms development and vehicles for such weapons have been 222 billion francs from 1960 to 1980.

Implementation of the broad complex of military preparations programs adopted by NATO countries is having a substantial impact on the scope and structure of their military-economic preparations. The bulk of the economic potential of modern capitalism is concentrated in the NATO countries. In 1979, they accounted for upwards of 68 percent of total industrial production in the developed capitalist countries and 58 percent of industrial production in all nonsocialist countries. Bloc participants also have considerable manpower available to them. All this serves as a material basis for systematically increasing militaristic preparations.

The leading NATO states have created and are striving to maintain in a state of high mobilization readiness a large military industrial production apparatus. Its main branches, especially in the USA, have significant surplus production capacity, which can be used for rapidly developing the production of military output under emergency conditions. Bloc leaders have recently been paying more attention to strengthening and improving the production base of their military industry. This results largely from the fact that they plan to begin producing a new series of weapons systems employing the latest scientific and technical achievements in the near future.

The development of such systems is accompanied by a whole series of measures aimed at eliminating existing weaknesses and bottlenecks in military industry, at strengthening and modernizing its production apparatus. To these ends, equipment is up-dated, technology is improved and various measures are carried out to stimulate new capital investment. Much attention is being paid to introducing new technology and automating production.

A complex of measures to intensify the military economy and increase the effectiveness of military expenditures is being carried out in the NATO countries. The reference is first of all to the extensive use of the achievements of scientific and technical progress, to improving the system of planning, financing, organizing and managing military preparations. Increasing importance is being attached to intensifying integration processes in the military-economic area, to standardizing arms, to the international cooperation and coordination of long-range, large-scale programs to increase the bloc's military might.

The arms race has reached impressive proportions in other imperialist states besides NATO member-nations. Military expenditures in Japan, for example, have increased rapidly, from 1,512.4 billion yen in the 1976/77 fiscal year to 2,230.2 billion yen ($10.137 billion) in the 1979/80 fiscal year. Reactionary circles are managing to modernize and substantially strengthen the armed forces of the country. Military preparations are being carried out within the framework of the American-Japan "security agreement." The USA is intensifying its pressure on Tokyo, demanding accelerated militarization, increased military might, a greater contribution to joint military measures, an expansion of Japanese obligations in the Pacific Ocean zone and greater participation by Tokyo in Pentagon global strategy.

Many of the developing countries are also being drawn more and more into the arms race. Their military expenditures have grown more rapidly than those in the world as a whole in recent years. Further whipping up of military preparations will lead not only to an increasing danger of thermonuclear war, but also to growth in extravagant military expenditures, which significantly retard economic development.

The shift to the counter-attack against detente and peace by aggressive forces, accompanied by a whipping up of the arms race, is a direct challenge not only to the world of socialism, against which it is primarily aimed, but also to the overwhelming majority of humanity, which is vitally interested in preventing a thermonuclear world war and in strengthening international security.

In the present, appreciably exacerbated international situation, the Soviet Union continues to follow firmly its own peace-loving policy, supported by all progressive forces on the planet. L. I. Brezhnev declared: "We oppose the 'doctrine' of military hysteria and a feverish arms race with a doctrine of systematic struggle for peace and security on Earth. We are faithful to the Peace Program put forward by the 24th and 25th Congresses of our party. We therefore stand for a strengthening of detente, not its destruction, now in the 1980's, as we did in the 1970's. We stand for a reduction in arms, not for fanning the flames of the arms race. We stand for rapprochement and mutual understanding among peoples, not for artificial estrangement and enmity."[1]

The Soviet Union and the fraternal countries of socialism are doing everything which depends on them to strengthen world peace, repulse the aggressive forces of imperialism, continue and deepen international political and military detente. The support of the overwhelming majority of humanity is on their side in this noble cause.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1981

11052
CSO: 1807/90

---

1. PRAVDA 23 February 1980.

DEEPENING ECONOMIC, POLITICAL CRISIS OF CAPITALIST SYSTEM DESCRIBED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 2, Feb 81 (signed to press 4 Feb 81) pp 13-29

[Article by I. Gur'yev: "Features of the Deepening Overall Crisis of Capitalism Under Present Conditions"]

[Excerpts] The conclusion by the 24th and 25th CPSU Congresses that the overall crisis of capitalism is continuing to deepen has been fully confirmed by an abundance of events, by the entire aggregate of trends inherent to capitalism in the 1970's and early 1980's.

The past decade went down in the history of capitalism as a decade of shocks. Since the end of World War II, such a variety of crises -- national and world, economic and social, domestic- and foreign-policy -- and such an accumulation of disorders, scandalous exposures and various kinds of disruptions of normal life has never fallen its lot as during these years. The duration and depth of all these crisis processes and shocks testify to the fact that behind them lies a profound deformation of the foundations and mechanisms of the dominion of capital in the capitalist part of the world.

Two very important directions of the deepening overall crisis of capitalism -- internal destabilization and the loss of previous positions in world development -- best describe capitalism as a society leaving an historical arena.

This shaking of foundations testifies to the overripeness of capitalism and is born primarily of the increasing complexity and aggravation of the contradictions of its internal and, in the final analysis, economic development. At the same time, the weakening of the positions of capitalism in the world is determined by the primary conflict of the modern era, the conflict between the two opposing social systems, and is a reflection of the increasing might and scope of the revolutionary renewal of the world begun by Great October. Both the shaking of the internal foundations of capitalism and the weakening of its positions in world development are two aspects of one and the same general process, that of a deepening crisis in the capitalist system.

Weakening of Positions in World Development. The historical retreat of capitalism is manifested most obviously in a reduction in the sphere of direct dominion of imperialism and in limitation of the strength and opportunities for it to resist the most important, central processes of the modern era, the freeing of humanity from social and national oppression, from destructive world wars.

The Great October Socialist Revolution freed 7.8 percent of the world's population from the rule of capital.

The victory of the revolutionary masses of Russia, won under the leadership of the Leninist party of bol'sheviks in October 1917, deprived capitalism of a monopoly on undivided dominion in the world.

The economic and military superiority of capitalism in the initial stage of its overall crisis enabled it to suppress the dissemination of the social and national-liberation revolution beyond the borders of Soviet Russia and then to drive mankind into World War II.

The world revolutionary crisis which was nurtured by that war and the victory of socialist revolutions in a number of countries of Europe and Asia permitted the start of fundamental change in the balance of forces in the international arena. The rise of the world socialist system headed by the Soviet Union, which has played a decisive role in defeating the shock forces of imperialist reaction in Europe and Asia, has substantially restricted the ability of capitalism to suppress the revolutionary struggle of peoples. Capitalism has not succeeded in overthrowing popular authority in a single country which has taken up the path of building socialism in the post-war years. Now, it cannot slow the development of the national liberation movement either. From the mid-1940's to the mid-1950's, more than 10 states of Asia, the Near and Middle East have been liberated from colonial dependence. The attempts by militarist circles of the capitalist countries to push the world into a new world war have failed.

The Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community, relying on the advantages of the socialist system, having ensured successful economic development in an atmosphere of sharp and strained competition with capitalism and by strengthening the moral-political unity of society and its defense capability, have continued to change the balance of world forces in their favor. The creation of a powerful nuclear missile potential by the Soviet Union has been of very important significance in this regard. In so doing, it eliminated the nuclear monopoly of the USA and the entire imperialist camp as a whole. Imperialism was deprived of one of its most important positions, strategic invulnerability, and, together with it, of the opportunity for unleashing a world war without retribution, in an attempt to resolve in its favor the conflict with socialism.

Nuclear missiles, their rise and improvements in them, have led to radical change in the very nature of world war, denying it the possibility of being a means of attaining any political goal. Under these conditions, the principled foreign-policy strategy of the socialist countries, stemming from the very nature of socialism and aimed at eliminating war from the life of society, has acquired particular force and persuasiveness.

In combination with the advantages of socialism in solving the most important economic, social and political problems of society, with the growth in the prestige and attractiveness of the peace-loving foreign-policy course of the socialist countries, the fact that the Soviet Union has achieved military-strategic parity with the largest imperialist state, the USA, has not only demonstrated once again the superiority of socialism as a system, but has also facilitated a transfer of historical initiative into the hands of socialism and growth in its influence on the course of world

events. Thus, a new stage in the development of the most important process of today, the revolutionary renewal of the world, began in the mid-1950's.

A third new stage has also unfolded in the deepening overall crisis of capitalism. Fundamental change in the balance of forces of the two systems in the international arena has led to a situation in which capitalism, and this is the most important feature of the present stage, is increasingly losing its ability to resist the processes of social and national liberation of humanity. The victorious revolution in Cuba, the first socialist revolution in the western hemisphere, and its defense, with the support of the Soviet Union, against intervention on the part of the USA, have been clear testimony to this fact. The national liberation revolution, encompassing all the colonial empires, has taken on a truely worldwide character in this historically new circumstance. Over the last decade and a half, from the mid-1950's to the early 1970's, about 60 countries in Africa, Asia and Oceania have been liberated from colonial dependence.

Capitalism's loss of its role as the decisive factor in world development and the establishment of the socialist system as that factor is a process of truly revolutionary importance. It flows in a sharp struggle in which partial and temporary retreats are possible, along with victories. This is a complex and quite prolonged process, inasmuch as capitalism, given the total irreversibility of its historical alienation from the life of society, remains a strong, dangerous opponent of social progress, an opponent possessing considerable reserves.

To illustrate, let us compare industrial production indicators in 1937 and 1979. In 1937, the capitalist system (including its colonial periphery) accounted for more than 90 percent of world industrial production. The contraction of the sphere of direct dominion of capitalism and, of primary import, the superiority of socialism in the dynamics of economic development led to a situation in which the developed capitalist countries accounted for only half of the total world industrial output volume in 1979. There has quite obviously been a trend towards the displacement of capitalism from the monopoly positions previously occupied by it in the most important, economic, sphere of life of human society. However, we must not fail to take into account the fact that industrial production grew 6.5-fold in the capitalist world during that same period.

Capitalism's reserves include not only its material-technical base, accumulated national wealth and military-economic potential, but also centuries of experience in managing society, which relies now on the combined force of the monopolies and the state, on all manner of bourgeoisie maneuvering so as to adapt to a changing situation. Also of importance is the force of habit of significant strata of the populations of the developed capitalist countries to the foundations of bourgeois society, its cult of acquisition, the illusions of parliamentary democracy, and so on. Capitalism also possesses more opportunities than previously to manipulate social consciousness through the mass media.

At the same time, capitalism's reserves are the reserves of a fading system. The very opportunities for using them are being undermined and restricted by those same factors which led that system to its overall crisis. They are not in a position to ensure for capitalism the perpetuation of its dominion, although they do enable the monopolist bourgeoisie to make fundamental changes in the world difficult and provide it with more or less effective opportunities to go on the counter-offensive against revolutionary forces. The course of events in the 1970's is a living illustration of this.

During this decade, especially the first half of it, imperialism was forced to retreat in a number of important directions and sectors. The turn towards detente, secured in a number of inter-state agreements, and the establishment in practical international life of the principles of peaceful coexistence by states with different social systems have been of top-priority importance. These principles, which meet the fundamental interests of all humanity, stem wholly and entirely from the essence of socialism and are determined precisely by its nature, and not by the nature of imperialism, which generates coercion and aggression. At this level, the turn away from the "cold war" to peaceful coexistence has testified to the success of the principled political policies of the socialist countries in the international sphere.

The development of mutually advantageous cooperation based on equal rights among states with opposing systems on a broad range of political, economic, scientific, technical and other problems, an important place among which has been occupied by the problem of preventing the threat of a nuclear missile war, has also been a testament to this success. For monopolistic capitalism, as its entire history indicates, international cooperation means the "cooperation" of the oppressor and the oppressed, the "man on a horse," cooperation in which the advantages are distributed only "by force." The nations of the socialist community have built and are building relations among themselves on entirely different foundations, those of equality and mutual advantage. They have instituted these same principles in their relations with countries freed from colonial dependence. They promote and insist on them in their relations with the developed capitalist countries.

Fundamental changes in the international arena have created conditions favorable to significant progress in the anti-imperialist movement, especially in the national liberation movement. A number of crippling blows suffered during this decade throughout the traditional colonial system, including elimination of the last and one of the oldest colonial empires, the Portugese, and the victory of the native population of Zimbabwe over the racists, have led to the total and final collapse of the imperialist system of colonial enslavement.

The fact that a large group of liberated states chose the goal of building societies free of exploitation and oriented towards socialism has been a blow to imperialism. In the wake of the military-political defeat in Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea, imperialism and its neocolonial policy suffered defeat in a number of other countries in different regions of the globe, including Angola and Ethiopia, Afghanistan and Iran, and Nicaragua.

In a subordinate position in the world capitalist economy and subjected to harsh exploitation and direct plundering, foremost by the transnational corporations, the countries freed from colonial dependence are intensifying the struggle to restructure that economy, to change their position in it.

The inter-state economic organizations and associations created by the developing countries have begun playing an appreciable role in protecting their interests. Thus, relying on fundamental changes in the international sphere, on limiting the "freedom of power maneuver" of the imperialist powers, and having nationalized their own petroleum resources once controlled by foreign monopolies, the OPEC member nations have succeeded in significantly raising petroleum prices.

The growth in the role of the liberated states in the economic and political development of the modern world is on the whole a factor in the continuing undermining of the positions of imperialism.

The increased attractiveness and international prestige of actual socialism, the transformation of the countries freed from colonial dependence into an active anti-imperialist force, the striving for fundamental changes encompassing the working masses of the developed capitalist countries, the loss of control over the course of the most important world events -- all this, in combination with the exacerbated internal instability of capitalism, has caused sharp dissatisfaction with the overall state of affairs in governing bourgeoisie circles. Under these circumstances, their prophets and political leaders are being replaced and the reactionary nature of imperialism is showing increasing strength.

Imperialist reaction, having attacked the process of detente and cooperation between countries with opposing systems, is attempting to revenge the defeats imperialism has suffered in the confrontation with socialism, in the struggle with the liberation movement. It is using a broad range of means, from "psychological warfare" against socialism to attempts to split the unity of the socialist and national-liberation revolutions, to push some developing countries off the path of socialist orientation, intensify the diplomatic and financial dependence of others, and so on. Imperialism's traditional reliance on force, the effort to change the evolving military-strategic parity in its favor, occupies a central position in this "collection."

Reliance on force has not saved imperialism from the insuperable process of erosion and loss of positions in the past either, when it did have military and economic superiority over revolutionary forces. Much less are there grounds now for thinking that such reliance is capable of forestalling the continued development of that process under present conditions.

In resorting to military blackmail, the leaders of the imperialist world, and foremost the USA, count on making the advancing development of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community more difficult, on retarding the dissemination of the world revolutionary process, on changing the course of world events that is now unfavorable to capitalism, on strengthening the shaken dominion of capital within the capitalist system itself. But, by accelerating military preparations and increasing arms expenditures, these leaders are striking at the socioeconomic development of their own countries, inasmuch as the arms race, by enriching the military-industrial monopolies, is having an unfavorable impact on the state of the national economies.

Thus, in terms both of absolute direct military expenditure amounts and their share of the domestic gross product, the USA has substantially outspent its partners among the developed capitalist countries throughout the entire post-war period. But that has provided the latter with an opportunity to maintain a production accumulation rate and economic growth rates higher than those of the USA for a long period, and in the final analysis, to achieve a substantial edging out of American capital from those positions it occupied in the first post-war years. The U.S. proportion of the industrial output of the capitalist world has decreased from 48.7 percent in 1950 to 37.3 percent in 1979; the FRG's proportion has increased from 6.3 to 8.8 percent, and that of Japan, from 1.6 to 9.7 percent. The U.S. proportion of world capitalist exports decreased from 18.1 percent to 12.1 percent during those years; that of the FRG increased from 3.5 to 11.7 percent, and that of Japan, from 1.5 to seven percent.

From this point of view, implementation of the U.S. demands on Japan and its own NATO partners regarding increased military allocations is capable of leading, in one form and degree or another, to changes in the balance of forces between the primary centers of imperialism. But imperialism's expansion of the overall scope of its military

preparations is incapable of altering the primary thing, the course of the historical competition between the two systems, of saving capitalism from the inescapable prospect of a further loss of its positions in world development. The reality of this prospect also results, in considerable measure, from the increasing internal instability of capitalism, from the collapse of its own foundations.

Growth in Economic Instability. The state of the capitalist economy in the 1970's provides, I suppose, the best grounds for evaluating the past decade as one of shocks. Various kinds of dislocations, snags and other forms of breakdown in equilibrium have been frequent since the late 1960's. However, the various manifestations of the intensified instability of economic development -- flashes of panic on the currency exchanges, deterioration in the balance of payments of several leading capitalist countries, intensified increases in costs, and so forth -- were initially perceived and interpreted by bourgeois politicians as annoying trivialities, as encumbrances caused by relatively spontaneous circumstances, mistakes by particular national institutions of economic power, inexactitude in the activity of international organizations, "economic egoism" of individual corporations and groups of corporations, and so forth.

However, the increase in the number of such "trivialities" during the 1970's, expansion of the sphere and growth in the scope of the dislocations, and in particular the outgrowth of individual national currency disorders into a world capitalist currency crisis, the aggravation of the ecological situation in various countries, the relatively sudden shortage which developed in very important raw materials, foremost in petroleum resources, and the headlong growth in prices for them, the practically simultaneous cyclical reductions in the production volume of the whole group of developed capitalist countries, the universal growth in massive unemployment, and finally the inflation which has encompassed the entire capitalist world, have toppled all the accustomed ideas about price movement when there is neither war nor military collapse.

As indicated in Table 2 [not reproduced for this report], the balance of payments of the developed capitalist countries has been exacerbated.

The change in the balance of payments of this group of countries and their nearly universal shift to negative balances during the 1970's are often explained as resulting from the energy crisis. The deterioration in the balance of payments is an indirect indicator of the exacerbation of this noncyclical crisis process as well.

Diverse noncyclical processes doubtless also affect the cyclical development of capitalist production by determining a number of its features and by changing the symptoms of individual phases of the cycle, and foremost the basic, cycle-generating phase, the crisis phase itself. In this regard, the most substantial new phenomenon in the capitalist economy of the 1970's was what came to be known as stagflation, the combination of a drop in production and unemployment growth with a simultaneous increase in prices. This course of events during the crisis inescapably leaves an imprint on the reproduction process in the remaining phases of the cycle as well. The numerous disruptions in economic equilibrium caused by noncyclical crisis processes multiply the number of direct prerequisites for cyclical crises by increasing their frequency.

The interweaving of different kinds of crisis phenomena, both deep and prolonged, is thus a most important characteristic feature of the growth in the economic instability of modern capitalism. But it is so to speak an external feature, an outward manifestation of a deeper, more essential processes of the tottering of the economic

underpinnings of capitalism. At present, we can see completely distinctly its main directions.

Inflation and the foreign exchange crisis testify to shakiness in the exchange mechanism. In the form of its energy, raw-material, food and ecological crises, bourgeois society is encountering a sharp exacerbation of the problem of meeting its own resources needs.

Inflation and the foreign exchange crisis, although each is generated by its own complex of reasons and prerequisites, reflects a single process, intensification of the all-around maladjustment of the present money circulation mechanism and, in so doing, of the commodity exchange mechanism as well. The unevenness in the inflationary increase in prices[1] and the unstable course of the national currencies have been accompanied by a break in the exchange proportions of commodity exchange in both domestic and international markets and has led to intensification of the disproportionality of the capitalist economy as a whole.

Inflationary price growth has been accompanied by the depreciation of operating capital and by a diminution of the actual value of depreciation deductions which have been set on the basis of initial cost of fixed capital, as well as by depreciation of profit, which subverts the impact of capital accumulation incentives, increases the risk of new capital investments and has an unfavorable effect on the intensiveness of the investment process. Inflation also has an unfavorable effect on credit relations -- the borrower turns out to be in a position preferable to that of the lender. As a result, interest rates rise and the loan use periods are shortened. But restricting the opportunities for using long-term loans, with a simultaneous increase in the cost of credit, facilitates further deterioration of the investment climate.

At the same time, the problem of providing capitalist society with resources is being exacerbated. The acquisition of ownership of their national resources by the liberated countries is the deeper basis for exacerbation of this problem, the basis for the shakiness of the supply mechanism which has evolved in the world capitalist economy -- meeting the needs of the imperialist centers for certain types of mineral raw materials and fuel by supplying them from the colonial and dependent periphery in any amount and at the very lowest price.

Capitalism has been faced with the necessity of adapting to the new situation. All ways of solving the problem of meeting the demand for energy resources -- whether the reference is to developing mineral fuel extraction of its own, to developing alternatives to petroleum and gas as energy sources, or to shifting to energy-saving equipment and technology -- require of monopolistic capital and states a serious restructuring of the economy, considerable capital investment and great effort. However, the energy situation continues to be aggravated, testimony foremost to the inability of the state-monopoly structure to adapt to practical solution of the problems.

---

1. Thus, given an overall increase in wholesale prices for manufactured goods of 149.5 percent from 1970 through 1980 in the USA, prices for chemical industry output increased 154.4 percent, metallurgical output -- 145.5 percent, food -- 116 percent, electrical-equipment machine building -- 90 percent and textile industry -- 70.8 percent (calculated from "The Handbook of Basic Economic Statistics," November 1980, pp 122-131).

The price proportion disturbances associated with inflation and the foreign-exchange crisis and exacerbation of the problem of ensuring the production of energy resources and raw material have complicated the reproduction process, accelerated the development of cyclical conflicts and facilitated increasing instability in the capitalist economy, which has been reflected in a certain increase in the frequency of crisis recessions, the deepest of which has been the 1974-1975 crisis.

Having spread simultaneously throughout the entire capitalist world, to all its leading countries and centers, it also encompassed all aspects of the economic life of contemporary bourgeois society -- industrial production, trade, the nonproduction and credit-financial sphere, which in turn predetermined its depth, duration and the difficulty in overcoming it.

One of the most important features of the current phase of increasing economic instability of capitalism is the polycentricity of that process. Crisis phenomena encompassing the exchange mechanism and the provision of capitalist countries with resources which are cyclically developed unfold simultaneously, and each has a serious impact on the state of the economy of capitalism as a whole.

The mechanism of this general process is in the end associated with monopolist capital, with that broad complex of contradictions in the capitalist form of production whose exacerbation is a most important feature of the monopolization process, of its lateral and vertical development. One illustration of this is the fact that the world capitalist economy, in which monopolization was distinguished by great dynamism in the 1950's and 1960's, had been transformed into a true generator of instability by the 1970's. It was precisely here that the foreign-exchange, raw-material, energy and a number of other crises which have profoundly affected the status of the national economies and the capitalist reproduction process as a whole were born. It was in this very area that intensification of the multifaceted monopolistic yoke caused increased resistance to it. The reference is not only to resistance to expansion of the transnational corporations, but also to the struggle of countries freed from colonial dependence against imperialism's monopoly of the world capitalist market, to the struggle of the national capitals of a number of the developed capitalist countries against the monopoly of American capital in certain very important spheres of the world economy, including foreign exchange, and so forth, which had become established in the post-war years.

The phase of increasing economic instability turned out to be most ruinous for the least-developed links in the world capitalist economy, the economies of the countries freed from colonial dependence. Their total official foreign debt (excluding OPEC member-nations) increased substantially, from $73 billion in 1971 to approximately $360 billion in 1980[1]; their lag behind the developed capitalist countries in per-capita gross national product increased (primarily for the group of countries importing liquid fuel).

The governing monopolistic bourgeoisie sees a very serious political danger to itself in the growing economic instability. Their awareness of this danger is testified to by the numerous attempts by the governments of the leading capitalist countries, made at the national and international levels, to seek out ways of resolving the most

---

1. See: "Development Cooperation. 1980 Review," Paris, 1980, p 220.

critical situations. Such attempts have inescapably been attended by expansion of particular forms of national or supranational state-monopolistic regulation, by the adoption and implementation of political resolutions and measures. However, opportunities for using these means are limited by the appreciable intensification of the instability of political development of modern capitalism, by the tremors in the system of its political dominion.

Unstable Political Development. In the post-war decades, the monopolistic bourgeoisie has made quite a few changes in its sociopolitical strategy and made certain concessions to the working masses. These concessions have resulted primarily from the defeats capitalism has suffered in connection with the development of the world revolutionary process and have been forced in nature. It is quite evident that they have been aimed at strengthening the foundations of the economic and political dominion of capital.

Bourgeois politicians and ideologs assumed that combining economic growth with a more active state social policy would create the conditions necessary for improving the social climate, weakening the class struggle and broadening the supports of capitalist dominion. The calculation turned out to be quite accurate, inasmuch as expanding production and increasing national income do create additional opportunities for social maneuvering.

However, under modern capitalism, economic growth is essentially and foremost an increase in the capital of the monopolies by intensifying exploitation of the working class, and more active state policies pursue the goal of strengthening the dominion of the monopolistic bourgeoisie. But at the same time, strengthening the oppression of capital is unavoidably accompanied by increasing resistance to it.

Noteworthy is the fact that the ideological-political crisis of modern capitalism was manifested in its basic outlines prior to the start of the economic shocks of the 1970's. Expansion of the sociopolitical crisis during a period of relatively good economic development is convincing testimony to the historical fate of a social system doomed, in the course of its "normal" development, to generate problems causing extreme mass agitation and protests.

In the 1970's, when economic shocks encompassed the entire capitalist world, the instability of its political development received new impetus.

One of the most distinct features of the political life of the developed capitalist countries in the 1970's has been the crisis of confidence in political regimes. In particular, it was manifested in diminished public interest in participating in elections and in a reduction in the body of the electorate in the largest bourgeois parties.

Along with the increasing social dissatisfaction of the workers, who refuse to trust bourgeois political structures and organizations, disagreements within the ruling class are another factor in political instability. As the direct control of the monopolistic bourgeoisie over state organs of power intensifies, the political sphere is increasingly at the mercy of monopolistic competition.

The degree of sharpness of these disagreements is also determined by conflicts between the private and common interests of the monopolistic bourgeoisie, which sometimes break out into sharp conflicts between individual monopolies and the state, by

struggle between individual political groups and the ruling elite, between its individual ideological-theoretical currents, which often propose mutually exclusive ways and means of resolving those critical, complex problems the dominant class and its ruling bosses encounter under present conditions.

The increasingly obvious inability of the state to cope with such social ills as crime, the spread of corruption to ever-higher links of state power, violations of the constitutional rights of citizens by the state itself, and so forth, are of substantial importance in the drop in the prestige of the ruling circles and in the tottering political hegemony of the monopolistic bourgeoisie.

In attempting to resist the weakening of the political foundations of its own dominion, the monopolistic bourgeoisie is intensifying its reaction along all lines. Under the pretext of combatting terrorism and "subversive activity," an assault on democratic rights and freedoms is unfolding, progressive elements are being driven out of the state apparatus, and various forms of control over the private and public lives of citizens are being instituted. At the same time, the shock detachments of monopolistic reaction, the far-right parties and political groups, are increasingly active.

The last fascist regimes in Europe (Portugal, Spain, Greece) suffered crushing defeats in the 1970's, but it did not eliminate that extreme form of imperialist reaction from the lives of the developed capitalist countries. Italy and the FRG still remain the traditional field of activity for these forces; a wild outburst of terrorist activity by left-extremist organizations -- the "Red Brigades" in Italy and the Baader-Meinhof group in the FRG -- in recent years has definitely and greatly helped strengthen them. Ultra-right forces in the USA, Great Britain and a number of other countries are increasingly active.

The effort by the monopolistic bourgeoisie to shift the burden of economic shocks onto the shoulders of the workers, the broaden the assault on the democratic rights they have won, is encountering stout resistance from the working class and the broad strata of the working population. The strike struggle, which began to grow appreciably during the late 1960's and which has attained even broader scope in the 1970's, has been a very sharp weapon and at the same time quite an accurate indicator of the scope of the class struggle of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

Intensification of the strike struggle is reflected in more than quantitative indicators. Its geography and groups of participants have expanded significantly. The active advocacy of strikes has become typical of workers in the nonproduction sphere and of numerous groups of employees previously considered "socially passive."

The present level, forms and directions of the mass strike struggle reflect more than an objectively new situation which was created for the proletariat by the development of state-monopolistic capitalism. The growth in the fighting activeness of the workers' movement is at the same time a consequence of internal changes in the working class itself, in its psychological make-up. Today, the worker reacts more sharply than he did several decades ago to such phenomena as low wages, unemployment and uncertainty about the future and the anti-worker policies and police repression of the authorities, and he fights any type of discrimination more energetically. The enormous influence the victories of socialism, which have in recent decades broadened the positions and influence of the working class in society, raising its level of culture

and education and its recognition of its own social worth, have had on the whole social and moral-psychological atmosphere in the capitalist world, has had its effect on this. The growth in the social needs of the proletariat comprises one of the most important features of the present stage of its development, and it is precisely that growth which has done much to determine the present scope and direction of the class struggle.

The many calls for strikes, which are clearly sociopolitical in nature in terms of their very slogans or their consequences, are multiplying.

Under today's conditions, the most common direction of working class political activeness is the fight to broaden its representation in central and local organs of power. It has achieved quite a few successes along these lines. In a number of countries, the political parties of the working class have won a large body of the electorate over to their side, which has ensured them relatively stable representation in the bourgeois parliaments. The situation is complex, however, in that the working class is represented primarily by the social democratic parties in the highest legislative bodies of a majority of the capitalist countries, and the class cooperation policies of those parties largely limit the importance of the parliamentary victories of the proletariat. The communist parties, which are represented especially broadly in the parliaments of France, Italy and Finland, use their parliamentary activity to defend in every way possible both the immediate and the long-range interests of the proletariat. Another important support for the political influence of the working class is municipal organs, in which communists play a large role in a number of countries. The activity of representatives of the proletariat vanguard in local organs of power clearly demonstrates to the workers the opportunities for and ways of democratically restructuring the system of managing society.

The political struggle of the working class of the developed capitalist countries is inseparably linked to its opposition to the right-extremist forces of imperialism, including the ultra-right, neo-fascist movements, which systematically threaten the democratic foundations of social life, as is evident in the case of Italy. The vanguard role of the working class in warding off the neo-fascist threat is manifested especially clearly in that country.

Intensification of the activeness of the worker movement's actions in international politics testifies to the higher political level of that movement in the capitalist countries. The proletariat, as the staunchest and most energetic force of the massive anti-war movement, has made a weighty contribution to the struggle against imperialist aggression in Vietnam and has played an appreciable role in establishing the policy of detente and developing the principles of peaceful coexistence. The current international situation, the critical nature of the significantly stepped-up arms race and the militarism of such socioeconomic problems as inflation and unemployment have faced the working class with the urgent necessity of developing a stubborn struggle to reduce military budgets and reorient military expenditures to peaceful needs, to reconvert a militarized economy and increase social allocations.

One of the clearest manifestations of the political assault of the proletariat is the strengthened positions and increased influence of its vanguard, the communist parties. Fraternal parties operate in 76 nonsocialist countries today and include in their ranks nearly five million people. The increase in their numbers in the 1970's is convincing testimony to the further strengthening of the positions of the

communist parties and the broadening of their mass base in these countries. At the same time, the strength of the political influence of the communist parties in the capitalist countries exceeds their size many-fold. The communist movement is achieving truly outstanding successes, given a strengthening of the positions of socialism and the forces of national liberation in the world.

These advantages of the communist movement have taken on particular importance given the increasing instability of modern capitalism. It is under precisely such conditions, when the economic and social contradictions are sharply exacerbated, that the crisis of the traditional bourgeois parties is obvious, that the ability of the communist parties to actively influence solving the most important problems of the life of society, to force the ruling classes to deal with the demands of the masses, is displayed most clearly. Communists have been initiators in advancing programs which shape a democratic alternative to state-monopolistic policies, proposing measures to curb inflation and rid them of unemployment and other calamities born of the dominion of large-scale capital. In this regard, the communist parties consider the interests of both the working class and the most numerous strata of the working population of their countries, which has created prerequisites for forming broad anti-monopolistic coalitions headed by the working class.

Taking into account the objective process of exacerbation of the instability of capitalism and the weakened dominion of the bourgeoisie and changes in the balance of the basic social forces of today in the world arena in favor of socialism, the communist parties have at the same time soberly evaluated the difficulty of the struggle, the unwillingness of the monopolistic bourgeoisie to reconcile itself to the inescapability of its departure from the historical scene.

Even in an atmosphere of the most critical political crises, the monopolistic bourgeoisie continues to maneuver, to seek out new opportunities for keeping power in its own hands. In this regard, the military-political unity of the modern international bourgeoisie also plays a considerable role. However, neither the maneuvering of the monopolistic bourgeoisie nor its effort to adapt itself to a changing situation, using even the slightest false step by the class forces opposing it, nor its military-political unity is capable of ridding modern state-monopolistic capitalism of the most profound social and political contradictions.

The interweaving of these contradictions and their daily synthesis are one of the most important and constant objective features of modern capitalism, which is most fully reflected in the struggle of the politically strengthened working class, relying on fundamental changes in the international situation, to meet its own needs, for social progress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1981

11052
CSO: 1807/90

ANALYSIS OF TURKEY'S CURRENT DOMESTIC, FOREIGN POLICIES

Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 15, 10-16 Apr 81 pp 12-13

[Ankara special dispatch for ZA RUBEZHOM by Aleksandr Viktorovich Filippov (born 1926), international affairs journalist, PRAVDA correspondent in Turkey, and Vladimir Borisovich Kudelin (born 1940), international affairs journalist, TASS correspondent in Turkey, candidate of philological sciences: "Turkey Between the Past and the Future"]

[Text] The military, which came to power in Turkey in September last year, continues the struggle against terrorist organizations that are trying to plunge the country into the abyss of chaos and anarchy. Reactionary, clerical and bellicose Maoist groupings have quieted down, waiting for the development of events. The country's economic situation remains unstable. Inflation rates are growing, the prices of staple commodities and foodstuffs are increasing, unemployment is on the increase and the foreign debt with which the Western monopolies and banks have enmeshed Turkey is growing. In foreign policy, the new government of Turkey, while throwing no doubt on its membership of the NATO bloc, is stating its intention to develop cooperation with neighboring countries, including the Soviet Union.

The plaintive voices of the muezzins break the predawn hush of an Ankara wreathed in dense fog. They are carried by the numerous loudspeakers mounted on the minarets of the city's mosques. The Mussulman is calling the faithful to their traditional morning prayer. The "radiobroadcast from the minarets" also reminds the inhabitants that the curfew introduced in all Turkish cities since September last year when the military seized power is lifted for the day. The military removed the civil administration which had become incapable of bringing the country out of a deepening political and economic crisis.

Contrasts in a Large City

Literally in just a few minutes the streets of this large city, where today more than three million people live, become alive. The spring air is filled with the roar of car horns and the scraping of the metal blinds being lifted from the fronts of offices and stores. The piercing whistles of the police mingle with the noisy voices of teenagers selling the crunchy bread rolls sprinkled with sesame seeds.

On the sidewalks squeaking motorcycles ply up and down laden with the morning newspapers, milk cans, vegetables and fresh bread. Crowds of people bustle about on their way to work or about their own affairs. The schoolchildren cross the streets in weaving lines....

At first glance life in Ankara is flowing quietly along. You could even believe that conditions of an extreme military situation do not prevail.

Around the presidential palace, where the present head of state, General K. Evren is installed and where the main services of the National Security Council, which has temporarily assumed the function of the highest legislative organ of the Republic of Turkey, have been located, the guard has been strengthened. The same picture is seen around the buildings of the now dissolved Great National Assembly and on the square abutting the House of the Council of Ministers. The empty premises, where before the arrival of the military the headquarters of various political and public organizations were located, are sealed up; their activities have been curtailed. A patrol moves unhurriedly along a central street; the soldiers, their short-barreled automatics at their sides, carefully watch what is happening all around. At crossroads chosen randomly, airborne troops having waved down an out-of-town taxi to the side of the road, are searching the passengers sitting in it and carefully checking the contents of their luggage. A team of municipal employees is posting enormous photographs of young people on walls and fences. "These are dangerous terrorists. Anyone who recognizes the criminals is requested to report to the military commandant's office immediately," proclaim the garish captions.

The voice of the announcer comes from the loudspeaker. He reports that new groups of terrorists have been arrested in Istanbul, Izmir and Adana.

In the two years alone before the military administration came to power, the terror occasioned by the forces of neofascism and the ultraleftist extremism of Maoist ilk and unprecedented in Turkey's history, claimed more than 5,000 lives. In addition, more than 15,000 persons were physically maimed. The governments formed alternately first by the Justice Party led by S. Demirel and then the Republican Peoples Party under B. Ecevit, reflecting the interests of the different strata of the bourgeois-landowning forces, were unable to normalize the political situation. The fierce struggle for power between these two leading political groupings made it impossible for them to pass legislation in the parliament that would have provided an opportunity to deal with terrorism effectively.

As a rule the victims of the terror were people with progressive views--teachers and students, activists in political and public organizations, journalists and parliamentarians--who spoke out actively for the country's peaceful and independent development. The eminent figure of the Turkish workers and trade union movement and World Peace Council member K. Turkler fell at the hands of terrorists. On the day before his death he spoke in Istanbul at a conference of the Confederation of Revolutionary Workers Trade Unions (DISK). Discussing terrorism, he stressed that right extremists and their patrons had set themselves the task of suppressing everything honest and progressive in Turkey, and in the international arena, of isolating it from its true friends. Somewhat earlier terrorists had made short

work of the well-known, progressive writer [A. Ipekci] who for many years was in charge of the liberal Istanbul newspaper MILLIYET. Former prime minister N. Erim was a victim of ultraleftist elements.

The Neofascists Long for Power.

On one of the central squares of the capital--[Sykhkhiye] Square--a mighty monument has been erected to the memory of the victims of political terrorism: two huge hands reaching in anguish toward the heavens. The newspaper MILLIYET wrote: "The designers of this monument wanted to depict the senseless cruelty of force that can never under any circumstances be justified."

In order to recruit people under the banner of terrorism, the leaders of the extremist organizations have made quite skillful use of factors such as the growing unemployment, which affects mainly the younger generation, mass dispossession of land and the impoverishment of small peasant families, illiteracy and the low living standard of Turkey's working masses.

Today the wave of terrorism has been generally subdued. People go to work, go visiting, go to the movie theaters and restaurants unconcerned, and are moving about the country. At institutes and schools studies are going on normally. Summing up some of the results of the six-month rule by the military leadership, the chairman of Turkey's National Security Council, head of state K. Evren, speaking at 28 March mass meetings in the southern Turkish towns of Manisa and Alasehir, stated in particular that during this time the roots of terrorism and anarchy have been 90-percent torn up in the country, more than 24,000 people have been placed under police surveillance or under guard accused of participation in terrorist acts, and weapons worth 25 billion Turkish lire have been confiscated by the authorities or handed in by Turkish citizens. In K. Evren's words, these weapons were coming from abroad. The head of state confirmed the period for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly--30 August through 29 October--adding that after it begins its work the date of parliamentary elections will also be announced.

The struggle against terrorism, however, continues. At the end of March the Turkish security force arrested in the outskirts of Adana more than 20 terrorists from a profascist "revenge team"-type extremist organization. When the criminals--guilty of more than 30 murders--were arrested, a large quantity of firearms and ammunition was confiscated. The military tribunals are investigating the activity of organizations and persons participating in the political disorders. The leadership of the neofascist National Action Party, which was the shock detachment of rightist reaction in unleashing terrorism, has been brought to book. The National Action Party has been receiving major financial support from the big bourgeoisie including the rich industrialist Bayrak. This businessman has a murky enough past. It is reported that during the occupation of Yugoslavia by the German invaders he served in the punitive units of the SS. The National Action Party has had close ties with the U.S. CIA, and the progressive press in the West has written about this on more than one occasion. The leader of this party, Turkes, in the past cooperated with the hitlerite special services and set up combat youth detachments along the lines of the Nazi stormtroopers. Right up to the time of his arrest the Turkish "fuehrer" maintained links with neo-Nazi groupings in West Germany.

The neofascists are openly seeking power, covering their actions with anti-communist and anti-Soviet hysteria. In the summer of last year they even carried out a "rehearsal" for combat operations, selecting for their site the small town of Yozgat in the south of the country. The fascist youths who suddenly appeared there raided the premises of democratic organizations, robbed banks and stores and beat up those who objected. Only the arrival of regular troops using force rid the population of the town from the bandits' violence.

The "fighters for democracy" and "human rights" in the West are shedding crocodile tears that the neofascists have been brought to trial. Attempts are being made to prove their innocence and have them freed.

Meanwhile, many honest observers note that if this grouping had succeeded in gaining power--and this possibility could not be excluded--Turkes had many supporters in the security services, police, and state and government establishments--it would have been a tragedy for the 46 million Turks. Physical destruction of the supporters of peace and democracy, which is proven from the "lists of agents of international communism" found at local branches of the organization, was a primary task for the neofascists.

Serious charges have also been laid against the clerical National Salvation Party led by the religious fanatic N. Erbakan. Speculating on the religious beliefs of the backward strata of the population, mainly the economically undeveloped rural areas in the east of the country, for which, as before, the highest level of unemployment and the lowest standard of living are characteristic, the clericals moved against the secular nature of a state, incapabi in their opinion of solving the basic socioeconomic problems. Forming parliamentary blocs first with groupings of the Justice Party, next the Republican Peoples Party, and then the neofascists, they more or less killed all the progressive measures of the authorities.

The National Salvation Party demanded replacement of the civil code of law with the legal norms of the shariat, which was even abolished by the founder of the Republic of Turkey, K. Ataturk, and rejection of the Latin script. The clericals fought for a return to the Middle Ages and waged a campaign aimed at forcing women to wear the yashmak again and excluding them from participation in public and political life. Resorting to acts of violence, they tried to close schools and libraries in the provinces and forbad girls to attend school. The obscurantism of the fanatics could not fail to outrage progressive society. In repeated statements the representatives of the military administration stress that the National Security Council and the government has a deep respect for the tenets and traditions of Islam, the religion of the overwhelming majority of Turkey's population. At the same time the statements also speak of the separation of church and state in the country. The fanatical strata of the clergy are warned that if in the future they interfere in the internal affairs of the republic and resort to acts of sabotage and force they will be decisively rebuffed.

The Accomplices of Reaction--the Maoists.

The activity of various kinds of ultraleftist groupings, which act under pseudo-revolutionary slogans and have embraced the shameful tactics of terrorism, has

also been decisively cut short. The leadership of the pro-Peking Workers and Peasants Party headed by the leader of the Maoists Perincek, the son of a big-time feudal lord, has been arraigned along with neofascists and clericals.

The subversive activity of this organization, which never experienced any shortage of funds, was in the nature of complicity with the forces of neofascism and reaction. For example, on days when the Turkish public held protest campaigns against U.S. plans to produce the neutron bomb or discussed the invasion of the territory of socialist Vietnam by the Chinese hegemonists, the Maoists preferred to remain silent and sit on their hands.

Through the newspaper [AYDYNLYK], published with a mass circulation, the Maoists made advances to the young people, calling them the "leading force of revolution." They incited the youthful masses, not versed in the finer points of political struggle, to armed actions. This was seen especially in the months when the government led by the leader of the Republican Peoples Party, B. Ecevit, was in power. This government took a number of steps aimed at expanding relations of good-neighborliness and cooperation with the Soviet Union and at pursuing an independent course in the international arena, and it emphasized the need to deepen the process of detente and peace. Together with the rightists, the Maoists launched an attack on this administration, accompanying it with an unbridled campaign directed against the Soviet Union. The anti-Sovietism of the Maoist organization, striving to unite all untraleftist groupings within its own ranks, was welcomed by the rightist conservative publications, including the neofascist newspaper [KHERGYUN], which like [AYDYNLYK] has today been closed down by the authorities.

Some time ago an interesting report appeared in the Ankara press. During the search made at the headquarters of the "Workers and Peasants Party" a large quantity of propaganda literature illegally imported from China was found, in particular, precepts and instructions for "waging partisan warfare," along with several hundred portraits of Mao Zedong.

It should be said that the Turkish Maoists have influential supporters within the country who are trying in every possible way to shield Perincek and his friends. A large group of highly paid lawyers is officially defending the Maoists at their trial. Nevertheless, the press reports that the military prosecutor has turned aside attempts to gain freedom for the leaders of the grouping of pro-Peking henchmen.

The Turkish public approves the course of the military authorities to root out terrorism and stabilize the political situation. At the same time it draws attention with some alarm to the fact that during the course of dealing with extremism, dangerous trends are coming into play--a desire to place the responsibility for various kinds of disorders and irregularities on progressive forces, which have always condemned the tactics of terrorism and force. On the order of the authorities a large group of activists from the Confederation of Revolutionary Workers Trade Unions led by its general chairman, A. Basturk, has been arrested. The absurd charge of "disorganizing political and economic life" has been brought against it.

A large group of activists from the Workers Party of Turkey has also been arrested; everyone has had the standard charge leveled against him. Recently a veteran of

the workers movement, the general chairman of the Workers Party, B. Boran, who was outside the country, was deprived of her Turkish citizenship. She refused to heed the demand of the authorities not to return to her homeland. About three weeks before this decision B. Boran had been sentenced in absentia to 8 years and 9 months in prison for "engaging in communist propaganda" during the elections to the Turkish parliament which took place in October 1979. The leader of the progressive Teachers Union, G. Gazioglu, has also been deprived of his citizenship. This has all caused rejoicing in the rightist camp....

The authorities have permitted the activities of the trade unions within the Confederation of Workers Trade Unions (TURK-IS), which has more than one-and-half million members. The rightists, conservative forces have always held strong positions in this confederation. It embraces mainly the workers and employees of the state sector of the economy together with a number of sectors in private production. Its activities have been allowed, but without the right to strike. The confederation leaders have recently held a series of meetings and conferences dealing with the position of workers and employees. One noteworthy detail--the representatives of the sector trade union speaking at these conferences said that the owners of businesses are adroitly taking advantage of the situation, constantly violate workers' rights and fire people they object to, sometimes labeling them as "terrorists" or "communist agents."

Despite the increased cost of living, the business owners refuse to raise wages. During the period December 1980 through February 1981 alone, the prices of foodstuffs and commodities increased 30 percent. The enterprise bosses drag their heels about signing collective work agreements with the trade union organizations. The dissatisfaction of workers and employees with the policy of the employers is growing, but it is true that up to now this has not spilled over into active forms of protest--evidently the trade unions are afraid to bring repression on themselves.

In the economic field the activities of the new authorities is oriented in the implementation of a complex of measures drawn up by the previous government. The course aimed at the preferential development of the private sector has been retained. "Healthy" measures implemented with respect to the state sector now provide for more extensive utilization of production capacities, many of which are still working at only 50 to 70 percent of capacity. A shortage of imported spare parts, raw materials and capital investment is making itself felt. At the same time, the authorities have succeeded in partially eliminating the shortages of fuel and petroleum products by bringing them in from abroad. However, they have still been unable to stem the tide of rising unemployment. As before, both young and old are the first candidates for dismissal.

As before, economic development plans are drawn up taking into account the attracting of foreign capital and obtaining extensive financial and economic aid from the West, which, as experience shows, is far from disinterested in this.

The West Pulls All the Levers.

Turkey recently succeeded in obtaining new loans and the postponement of part of its debts from old borrowing. For this, however, Ankara had to repeatedly devalue its currency and offer a number of weighty preferences for foreign capital, which is

trying to seize key positions in the Turkish economy and even cut back production in sectors that are competing with firms in the West.

Today, Turkey owes the West more than $20 billion. The economists have calculated that in order to settle accounts with its creditors it will take at least 70 years, and this assumes that Ankara would borrow no more in the meantime. But without foreign loans, the Turkish economy, which is closely tied to the economy of the West, cannot be developed.

The economic difficulties being experienced by the country are largely the result of the policy imposed on Turkey by the United States and other states in the West since World War II. As a member of NATO, Turkey has been forced to maintain an army of 500,000 and spend up to 20 percent of the national budget for military needs. And this heavy burden has been laid on the shoulders of the working population.

Having lost its military and economic positions in Iran since the overthrow of the monarchy there, the United States is now making greater efforts to consolidate itself with Turkey and enlist it for the accomplishment of its aggressive plans in the Middle East and Near East regions, using economic levers for this. In particular, it links the realization of these ends with a new Turkish-U.S. military treaty to revive more than 20 bases and sites located on Turkish territory and leased by the Pentagon. In this exceptionally complex period when the Turkish people are striving to extricate themselves from the grips of an economic and political crisis they are trying to heap an extra military burden in the interests of the U.S. military-industrial complex.

The progressive public in the country--and this finds constant expression in the progressive publications--condemns the U.S. plans for expansion and calls for the liquidation of military bases. The course of the new administration in Washington aimed at whipping up international tension and the nuclear arms race and kindling anti-Sovietism on an international scale has not found support among Turkish workers.

In an article carried on the pages of the newspaper ENI ULUS, commenting on the results of the 26th CPSU Congress, the well-known international affairs journalist, T. Atayev, wrote: "The remarkable report that Leonid Ilich Brezhnev delivered from the tribune of the Soviet communists was permeated with a real concern for peace and the desire to support detente and bar the road to thermonuclear war. It is these noble aims that the new peace initiatives of the Soviet Union serve. It should be remembered that the world in which we live is our only home....

"The United States and other powers in the West should seriously concern themselves with the timely Soviet initiatives which respond to the hopes and aspirations of peoples throughout the world. To fight for implementation of the Soviet proposals is to fight for peace and a bright future."

In the international arena, the Turkish leadership, remaining loyal to the treaty obligations in the NATO bloc and to various agreements with powers in the West, at the same time is striving to provide enough elbow room for independent foreign policy actions. This has been seen, in particular, in the line of further cooperation with the Soviet Union.

....Almost in the exact middle of Ankara, on a high hill from where, when the weather is clear, the panorama of the Turkish capital is stretched out before the viewer, a majestic monument is being raised built from granite and marble. This is the mausoleum of the leader of the national liberation movement, the founder of the Republic of Turkey, K. Ataturk.

On the Basis of Good-Neighborliness.

In Turkey they remember well that in response to K. Ataturk's request sent on behalf of the Great National Assembly proclaiming the country's independence, the Soviet government headed by V. I. Lenin was the first in the world to recognize the new Turkish state and establish diplomatic relations with it. Turkish patriots were given aid in the form of weapons and ammunition, food and gold. In the international arena, Soviet diplomacy actively defended the interests of embattled Turkey.

Speaking on one occasion in the parliament, K. Ataturk recalled with gratitude that "the victory of the new Turkey... would have been attended by incomparably more sacrificies and perhaps would even have been impossible had it not been for Russia's support.... And it would be criminal if our nation were to forget this aid."

The peoples of the two countries recently noted a glorious date--the 60th anniversary of the signing in Moscow on 16 March 1921 of the Treaty on Friendship and Brotherhood between the Soviet state and Turkey. This historic document signified the establishment of interstate relations on the Leninist principles of good-neighborliness and cooperation, mutual aid and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. The Soviet State renounced all the privileges, debts and territorial claims of tsarist Russia against Turkey. The treaty strengthened the positions of the Turkish patriots in the struggle for the further consolidation of national independence. It provided them with an opportunity to achieve favorable conditions in relations with other states.

We Soviet journalists working in Turkey frequently have had occasion to meet people who have told us how during the Thirties specialists from Soviet Russia helped the country to build the textile combines. Our interlocutors are unfailingly warm when recalling the joint labor of the Turkish and Soviet workers and engineers. They have noted that the last 10 to 15 years of good-neighborliness have provided many splendid examples of relationships of fruitful cooperation.

Giants like the Iskenderun metallurgical complex, the oil refinery at Izmir, the Seydisehir aluminum combine and others of great significance in the development of Turkey's national economy have appeared on the Turkish land. They have to a significant degree reduced Turkey's dependence on the monopolies of the West and promoted an increase in available jobs.

The Turkish Minister of Industry and Technology, S. Kocatopcu, with whom we talked, called these sites impressive monuments to cooperation. He emphasized that this cooperation, free from any kind of moments infringing upon national sovereignty, has acquired a stable and long-term character. A new agreement to expand the production capacities of the Seydisehir aluminum combine was signed recently in Ankara. Several months before that, a similar agreement had been signed in Moscow for the

Iskenderun metallurgical enterprise. Relations between our countries are also built on mutual advantage in the sphere of trade. About 8 percent of Turkey's total foreign trade turnover is with the Soviet Union, which buys traditional Turkish exports, mainly agricultural and livestock raising produce, and also cotton articles. In its turn, the USSR provides Turkey with goods that its developing economy needs acutely. In the opinion of local specialists, output from the Soviet Union, and this means, in particular, machine tools, electrical and oxygen equipment, coal-mining equipment, excavators and bulldozers and much else, is reliable and of high quality. Contacts between the Soviet Union and Turkey in the spheres of culture and art are also being strengthened.

It is no secret, however, that within Turkey there are quite influential forces for whom the ascending line of Soviet-Turkish good-neighborly links and cooperation is not to their liking. They would like to push the country away from this path. But it is becoming increasingly difficult for them to do so. Recently, when receiving the leader of a Soviet government economic delegation, USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations chairman, S. Skachkov, the Turkish prime minister, B. Ulusu, stated that the Turkish leadership will do everything it should to further develop relations of good-neighborliness and cooperation. Here, he stressed that consistent strengthening of links between the two states is one of the main directions in Turkey's foreign policy course. The Soviet Union, he noted, understands our difficulties and aspirations and we appreciate this.

The words of Leonid Ilich Brezhnev at the 26th CPSU Congress that "we are ready to further develop good relations with our neighbor Turkey" were met with great attention and interest by the Turkish public. They have been widely commented upon in all the mass information media. Soviet-Turkish relations, at whose sources stood V. I. Lenin and K. Ataturk, wrote the major newspaper MILLIYET, are being filled with new content that meets the vital interests of the two neighboring peoples, and with the high aims of durable peace, security and international relaxation. And we should live as good neighbors.

9642

CSO: 1807/101

UKRAINIAN RURAL CONSTRUCTION MINISTER ON BRANCH'S PROGRESS, PROBLEMS

Kiev RADYANS'KA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian 12 Apr 81 p 2

[Article by Yu. Kotov, Ukrainian Rural Construction minister: "Construction In the Village"]

[Text] The agro-industrial complex development in the 11th Five-Year Plan depends to a large extent on the tempo and quality of capital construction in the village, on an increase in its effectiveness. The activities of all construction workers should be directed towards realizing these tasks. First of all, basic funds should be provided at the appropriate time as well as production capabilities, living quarters and social-cultural facilities.

Achievements of the Tenth Five-Year Plan should serve as a basis for the new step forward in the 11th Five-Year Plan. In the above mentioned period construction organizations within the UkSSR Ministry of Rural Construction fulfilled 3.6 billion rubles worth of contract works. The extent of construction increased by almost 14 percent compared to what was accomplished in the previous five years. The following figures characterize the activities of rural construction workers. During the Tenth Five-Year Plan they constructed and put to use facilities for 475,000 cows and oxen, poultry factories for 21.4 million birds, elevators for a total capacity of 4.2 million tons of grain, mills with a 24-hour productivity of 1.8 thousand tons, and mixed feed enterprises producing 5.5 thousand tons per 24-hour period.

In a report to the 26th Party Congress, the CC CPSU General Secretary, comrade L.I. Brezhnev said: "With the industrialization of agricultural production, deep changes are taking place in the lives of kolkhoz rural population...Even today it is pleasant to visit many kolkhozes and sovkhozes. It is nice to enter spacious, bright buildings, where city conveniences combine with the peculiarities and needs of rural life. New work character, contemporary lifestyle and the appearance of these villages -- these, comrades, are the beneficial fruit of our socialist politics!"

There are quite a few villages in the Ukraine which can serve as an example of well-planned construction. For example, there is the village Kamyanka in Ochakivskiy Rayon, Nikolaevskaya Oblast. Its complex rebuilding is being done according to a plan by the Nikolaev section of the "Dipromistobuduvannya" [sic, Dnepr city construction]. During the past decade almost 8,000 square meters of living area were constructed here, that is half of the whole living quarter

renovation fund was used. In addition to one-story homes for kolkhoz workers built according to typical and individualized plans, fourteen two-story and one four-story building were also constructed.

There is a culture building in the center of the village, a memorial complex, a museum of war and worker glory, trade-customer enterprises, a school and a nursery.

The streets are asphalted, there are sidewalks, gas, a system of engineering communications (water line, heat lines, sewerage) -- all this makes the living conditions of Kamyanka residents similar to those of city inhabitants.

It is also very important for those of us who are in construction that Kamyanka rebuilding was planned and conducted on an industrial basis with the use of unified, reinforced concrete products ready to assemble. Thanks to this our "Nikolaevsil'-bud" [Nikolaev rural construction] trust was able to organize production line construction in Kamyanets' and to shorten its dates.

Many of our ministry's construction organizations made an important contribution to the republic's rural reconstruction and renovation. Because of their efforts in the past five-year plan almost 4 million square meters of living area were built for kolkhoz and sovkhoz workers and specialists; schools and vocational training institutions for 284,000 students; pre-school children's institutions for 45,000; hospitals for 7.3 thousand beds, etc.

Overall, our achievement for the past five years -- more than six thousand facilities put to use.

Quite a lot was done towards further development and strengthening of our own production basis in the ministry subdivisions.

We learn not only from positive experience but also from mistakes and unfinished work which still occur. A substantial fault in the work of ministry subordinate organizations, for example, was the dispersion of worker and material-technical resources over many facilities. This led to violations in construction technology, a lowering of technical-economic indicators and, in a number of instances, to sudden changes in dates for new building use. Therefore, in the new five-year plan, when the extent of contract work will grow by 16.9 percent compared to the previous and will reach 4.2 billion rubles, we directed special attention to work organization and concentration of forces and means on the most important facilities.

We had to reach certain conclusions also in the important problem of personnel availability.

Along with an increase in the extent of construction-assembly work, its character will change substantially in the new five-year plan.

The number of technically complex facilities especially will increase considerably in the construction program to be fulfilled by ministry organizations between 1981-1985. In 1981 alone eight large bread product combines are expected to be ready for use.

Living quarter and social-cultural construction will also develop rapidly. Almost a million square meters of housing and social-cultural facilities with a total area of 600-650 thousand square meters per year -- these are the parameters which determine its scope.

Rural construction work production basis will expand further. In the 11th Five-Year Plan more than 300 million rubles have been appropriated for its development.

In connection with the complex tasks set before the rural construction workers an urgent need arose to improve the administration. A program-special purpose method of branch development planning has been used at the ministry: nine special purpose complex programs were developed and put into effect which encompass almost all technical, organizational and economic sides of its activity.

These programs apply to a circle of problems important for our whole country. Thus, the program "Planning and administration" is directed towards realizing measures to assure fulfillment of the CC CPSU and USSR Soviet of Ministers decision "On improving and strengthening the influence of the economic mechanism for raising labor effectiveness and quality."

The program for industrializing the construction of grain processing enterprises examines issues relating to speeding up the use of mills, mixed feed factories and elevators.

The ready for assembly program is especially concerned with problems relating to the organization of accelerated construction of housing, schools and nurseries in the village. A fundamental stress was placed in it upon using large panels and blocks in the construction of such facilities.

A complex of measures outlined in programs "Quality", "Work", and "Construction Industry" will promote radical improvements in the quality of all work, work and living conditions of rural construction workers, and a further development of their own production basis.

The realization of all complex special purpose programs will provide in the 11th Five-Year Plan a 15 percent increase in labor productivity and will yield an economic effect on the order of 40 million rubles.

Although there are still quite a few shortcomings in rural construction, still we do have all reasons to say that the making of the Ministry of Rural Construction as chief contractor in the village along with Ukrainian interkolkhoz construction is already behind us. Today almost 160,000 workers are employed in 52 building-construction trusts and 98 industrial enterprises of the ministry. Each tenth worker is a communist. This is a completely formed detachment of construction workers which puts up all kinds of facilities in all rural areas of the republic, including the most remote.

Utilization of the experience of better construction organizations such as the "Zhytomyrsil'bud" [Zhitomir rural construction], "Ukrsil'enerhmontazh" [Ukrainian rural energy assembly] and "Ukrelevatormlynbud" [Ukrainian elevator mill construction] trusts promotes success in the work of construction organizations and

construction industry enterprises. Of course, production leaders and innovators may be found in all of our subdivisions without exception. Getting ready to meet the 26th CPSU Congress and the 26th Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party, 76 travelling mechanized units and more than 900 brigades, almost 100 sections and 8,000 workers fulfilled ahead of time the plans for two months of this year.

I.M. Ivanets', initiator of a socialist competition for achieving the highest labor productivity by decreasing labor time losses, USSR state prize winner, complex brigade leader in the "Boryspil'sil'bud" trust completed the Tenth Five-Year Plan ahead of time and fulfilled the 1981 plan prior to the opening of the 26th CPSU Congress. The Komsomol youth brigade of plasterers PMK-176, "Krymsil'bud" trust, headed by T.A. Kryshanivs'ka is working on February 1982 plans.

Eight of the best from among the better rural construction workers, who work in various oblasts of the republic, were elected delegates to the 26th CPSU Congress. This high honor was allotted to painter-plasterer brigade leaders K.K. Kostyuk from Vinnitsa area and M.K. Momotok from Rovenskaya Oblast, painter brigade leader N.V. Romashkina from the Voroshilovgrad area, plasterer V.S. Andreyeva from Nikolaevskaya Oblast, assembly brigade leader from the "Pivdenelevatorbud" trust V.T. Korets'kyy, plasterer-painter K.P. Kaparchuk from Kherson area, brick-layer R.T. Kayhorodova and brick-layer brigade leader M.I. Sokolenko from Cherkassy area.

We want to spread as widely as possible the experience of leading collectives and production innovators -- that is our reserve, a limitless spring of increasing labor productivity and improving work quality in the new five-year plan.

We know that successful construction work is dependent to a large extent on relations with customers and designers. But, it must be admitted, not all is well here. For substantial rural construction work improvement a more specific coordination of joint efforts is essential. The concern is primarily for cost concentration, timely building technical documentation, and technological equipment. Although these problems are not new they are very urgent. Today, when the goal is to increase the effectiveness of capital investment and to lower rural construction cost, they should be solved more actively and harmoniously.

Unfortunately, customer activity often shows only in the phase of including the facility in the plan. Also, some customers remain bound by old ideas, are timid in utilizing widely the possibilities of large panel home building in erecting housing, thus restricting the use of our new capabilities.

Dozens of various organizations and departments are Minsil'bud customers. Hundreds of planning institutes and their branches work on plans for them. It is hardly necessary to prove how this departmental dispersion hinders the introduction of scientific-technical progress achievements even in the planning stage.

We feel that this problem as well as a number of others could be solved by the joint efforts of our ministry and its basic customers -- Ministries of Agriculture, Sovkhozes and Procurement under the leadership of UkSSR State Construction. Experience acquired locally shows how much this coordination is needed and how important it is in rural construction. In Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast, which achieved

considerable success in village renovation, an oblast inter-departmental commission was formed uniting planning, construction, supply and other representatives. This commission is headed by the oblast executive committee chairman. It is concerned with planning, organization, construction and regular financial and material-technical resources for rural structures.

There is one more issue which cannot be avoided. I am thinking of complex village construction of their administrative-farming and cultural centers. This matter has long ago passed the trial stage and should be widely spread. Yet, departmental disunity has prevented mass introduction of this effective method of rural construction. Funds for social-cultural and housing construction are allotted to various organizations which, unfortunately, do not always find ways and opportunities for cooperation. There are instances when our builders having finished a school or club in one village or another, return in a year or two to build a hospital or nursery, one or two buildings for specialists. Of course, with complex rural construction Minsil'bud organizations could avoid this force dispersion and also do their work faster with lower cost expenditures.

The new five-year plan, indicated L.I. Brezhnev, will be a serious test for construction workers. Ukrainian rural construction workers will do everything to pass this test with honor.

9443
CSO: 1811/42

REPORT ON 8TH CONGRESS OF UKRAINIAN WRITERS UNION

Shcherbitskiy Address

Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 9 Apr 81 pp 1-2

[Speech at 7th Congress of Ukrainian Writers on 7 April 1981]

[Text] Honored Comrade delegates!

Honored guests!

Five years have flown by rapidly and here we are meeting again at our regular congress, the highest writers' council of the republic. Permit me on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the Republic to convey a hearty greeting to you, representatives of the large detachment of masters of the artistic word of the Soviet Ukraine, and to wish you successful and productive work in your congress (prolonged applause).

We are glad to see our guests in this hall today and extend them a hearty greeting--delegates of the Union of Writers of the Soviet Union, and writers' organizations of Moscow, Leningrad and the sister republics of our country (applause). Your participation, dear comrades, in the work of the congress of writers of the Ukraine is another clear demonstration of the inviolable fraternal friendship of the peoples of our socialist homeland and their profound spiritual unity (applause).

Comrades! Your congress, said comrade V. V. Shcherbitskiy, is taking place at a remarkable time, when throughout the country work for implementation of the historic decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress is unfolding on an immense scale with great energy and enthusiasm.

The highest forum of the Leninist party has convincingly demonstrated its ideological and organizational unity, the tight solidarity of the entire party and all the people around the Central Committee and its Politburoau headed by that true Leninist, that indefatigable fighter for peace and social progress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev (turbulent applause).

We are confident that the creative intelligentsia of the Soviet Ukraine, its active and militant detachment, the republic's writers, like all our people, have

accepted the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress with an open heart and profoundly recognize their responsibility and role in their implementation (applause).

The party considers the upsurge of socialist spiritual culture and the expansion and elevation of its social functions to be one of the main patterns in the development of a mature socialist society. And the immense front of peaceful and dynamic creativity on behalf of the Soviet man provides a great deal of room for creative thought, for all-around disclosure of artistic talent.

The 26th CPSU Congress, as you know, devoted a great deal of attention to questions of cultural construction and the development of literature and art. The activity of the Soviet artistic intelligentsia was given a high rating. This is a just and well-deserved rating.

Now, as Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev emphasized, "another tidal wave is rising in Soviet art." One can say with confidence, comrades, we are seeing a steadily increasing tendency toward increased artistic mastery, innovation, and the flourishing of the talent of the artist--an active builder of a communist society.

The achievements of Soviet multinational art--the art of knowable thought and lofty feelings--confirm the productivity of the course of the Communist Party in the sphere of spiritual culture, in questions of guiding the creative process. This course is based on principles of socialist realism which have been proven in life. And we have every reason to note that the literature of the Soviet Ukraine like all sister literatures, is a reflection of the actions and thoughts, the artistic biography of our people, that the writers of the republic will honorably carry the leninist banner of convictions of the party and the people (applause).

We are glad that the artistic writers are striving to study life more deeply, to extract crucial themes from it and to re-create typical modern characters. On the whole, the artistic level of prose, poetry, dramaturgy and commentary has risen, and their thematic range has expanded. Many works have received union-wide recognition.

It should be emphasized that in a socialist society the authority of the artist is extremely great, particularly that of the writer whose words are capable of inflaming the hearts, spirits and minds of millions of people. This authority has been won by all generations of Soviet artistic writers.

The party and the people pay a great deal of attention to writing talent which is to our common national credit. We understand that the work of writers, like any creative work, is not easy. In K. Marx's words: ". . . it is a hell of a serious matter, the most intensive work." But this respected and honorable work is work that is very necessary to the people. And the Communist Party and the Soviet State value it highly. Suffice it to say that during the years of the Tenth Five-Year Plan alone almost 150 writers of the republic were awarded orders and medals of the USSR, certificates of honor and certificates of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR. There were 57 masters of the word who were winners of union and republic prizes. In essence, comrades, every fifth Ukrainian writer earned high distinction (applause).

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers and local party and soviet agencies contribute in all ways to the extensive participation of writers in social and political life and to the activization of the literary process. The work of the republic Union of Writers and its party organizations has begun to show more initiative in handling of concrete subject matter. Their mobilizing and educational role has increased and they have established closer contacts with other creative unions, the press, television and radio. All this, of course, has a positive effect on the result of literary activity.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine thinks that the Union of Writers and its party organizations should continue in the future to work for providing a businesslike and friendly atmosphere and for creating more favorable conditions for the work of each writer.

The reader undoubtedly has the decisive word in evaluating the work of the writer. Our Soviet people are justly known to read more than any other people in the world. One might add that they are also demanding readers. To create for them is a serious test of each artist.

I do not think you will be offended if I express the opinion we still do not have enough truly wise books which could become important landmarks in cultural life. It is generally known that the only literary works that can become phenomena in cultural life are those which can, in the words of V. I. Lenin, "combine the feelings, thoughts and will . . . of the masses, and elevate them," when they are imbued with the living breath of time. A high ideological and artistic level, a bold solution to critical moral problems of modernity, innovative artistic search in the sphere of human interrelations, and constant attention to the formation of the individual, his internal world and his place in the historical process--such are the features inherent in the best works of our Soviet literature. And it is frustrating when some writers, even talented ones, sometimes waste their energy on secondary themes or else, as they say, wander around the outskirts of literature.

On the other hand, no less harm is caused by the somewhat easier, I would say unimaginative, approach of individual authors to the development of socially weighty and crucial themes. And, of course, one is troubled when an artist (we are undoubtedly speaking about individuals), at the height of his power, for years on end fails to confirm his artistic status with new works, living on past glory, and essentially loses his literary name. His colleagues should undoubtedly have the courage to point this out to him promptly and in a friendly way.

Our Soviet society is a society of working people. Labor is the creator of our national wealth and our country's power as well as the guarantee of our security. As we know, nothing in the world comes without effort. All of our material and spiritual values are the products of the minds, talents and working hands of our people. Naturally, the main hero of Soviet literature is the working man, the active builder of a new life. And literature should reproduce more clearly the image of our contemporary who is marked by the breadth of his thoughts, a state approach, a feeling for the new, high political development, and Bolshevist intolerance of everything that impedes our progress.

For the artist who is nourished by the interests of the people, who is vitally associated with them, the themes of creativity are dictated by life itself, by our Soviet reality. Let us take for example the tasks that are carried out by the working class--the leading force of our society. Radical changes are now taking place in industrial production. Extensive modernization of enterprises is underway in branches that are traditional for our republic--metallurgy, the coal industry, machine building--and new technology is being actively introduced. And, as Maxim Gorky noted, only "by looking straight into the face of the plants and factories," into the life of labor collectives, can the artist really reach the essence of the economic, social and cultural transformations in our society and point out in a talented way those whom the great proletarian writer called the knights of labor, the people "with new revolutionary energy and thought."

A no less important theme for whose disclosure Ukrainian literature obviously deserves credit is the life of the Soviet rural areas. Here is a broad field for creative research and clear depiction of those qualitative changes that have taken place and are daily being implemented in the life of rural workers, especially since the March (1965) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. L. I. Brezhnev called the new nature of labor, modern life and the appearance of our rural areas good fruits of the social policy. We also know about difficulties and problems in this vitally important area, and we are not silent about them. Our party and all the people are working persistently on solving them. The impassioned artistic word and a clear image will also help a great deal in this nation-wide matter.

If we were to continue the list of themes which, in our opinion, artistic literature should assimilate more actively and profoundly in our busy times, then, of course, we could not bypass the immense area of science. Soviet scientists are providing excellent examples of truly creative labor and effective materialization of scientific thought.

The demonstration of labor heroism of our contemporaries, noted Comrade V. V. Shcherbitskiy, requires the same force of artistic embodiment as was required for singing the praises of the heroes of the revolution, the civil and Great Patriotic Wars, and the first five-year plans in the best works of Soviet literature.

There is no need to show the responsible role played by literature and art in the education of the younger generation. Young people now comprise a large part of our society. They constitute an energetic and active force. And we undoubtedly need new literary works by talented writers concerning young workers and grain growers, young people studying in vocational and technical schools and students--concerning those who are continuing and will continue to promote the cause of their forefathers. We need works which not only correctly show how our youth live, work and study and serve in the military, but also which enrich their spiritual world, confirm a clear class position and teach nobility of attitudes and feelings.

The true talent of an artist consists also in that he can look far into the future, show the heroes of his works in maximum proximity to our moral ideals and make them models to be imitated.

Comrades! One might say that the authorial rule of socialism is Leninist friendship of peoples of our multinational country. The historical service of Soviet

literature consists in that its healing juices nourish the mighty tree of our brotherhood and illuminates its brightest facets for all mankind. This was once again confirmed by the Shevchenko literary and artistic holiday entitled "In A Voluntary New Family," which truly displayed all the colors of our multinational culture.

Next year the Soviet people will celebrate the 60th anniversary of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The celebration of this remarkable historical date will undoubtedly be a new demonstration of the triumph of the Leninist national policy of the CPSU. The 1,500th anniversary of Kiev will also be a brilliant celebration of the friendship and brotherhood of the Russian, Belorussian, Ukrainian and all other peoples of the homeland. And our literature and art must help us to become more aware of the continuity of our historical destiny and our revolutionary, military and labor traditions and instill a feeling of proud belonging to the unified Soviet homeland. This will undoubtedly also help to understand better the tasks of today and the matters that will have to be dealt with in the future.

Literature and art play a special role in the proliferation of the moral values of socialism. To investigate and in all ways reveal the socialist originality of our morality and its superiority over bourgeois morality is a truly noble cause of our writers.

Of course there is no point in simply ignoring the complex problems which the party and people are working to solve, the critical vital conflicts, the struggle between the new and the old and outdated. Literature and art must kindle their critical fire against manifestations of the philistine psychology of small property owners, egoism and self-interest. And in view of all this literature is called upon to agitate the people--otherwise it will not fulfill its social and artistic function.

The impassioned word of the writer has also been a strong weapon in the struggle for peace and the most sacred right of the peoples--the right to life. The republic's writers' union has a right to be proud of this category of public activists which not only carries the banner for peace in their works, but has been and is a direct organizer of the noble advancement of people of good will.

It is the sacred duty of the artist to establish bright feelings of patriotism and class solidarity in the hearts of our people and instill in them a love for the socialist homeland. This theme is one of the important social orders of our party and people to writers and activists of art.

Comrades! Soviet literature is in the avant-garde of the world literary process and exerts an ever increasing influence on the progress of world culture. Along with many other works of domestic literature, books written by writers of our republic are well known abroad. Soviet art appears on all continents as a spiritual ambassador of our people, voice of our world view and our socialist way of life. We understand this well, and our ideological opponents also understand it.

The spiritual life and artistic culture of socialism is for our class enemies not so much an object of captious study as an object for constant ideological sabotage.

One after another they arrange loud campaigns about "violations" of the rights of man in socialist countries, about an "absence" of freedom of creativity, about communist spiritual "expansionism." What can one say about this? Socialist writers, like the rest of our people, can not put up with the wildly hostile attacks on our country and our social conquests. A decisive rebuff to the dirty slander, the unmasking of the true essence and direction of ideological sabotage--such is and, we are convinced, always will be the civic position of the Soviet writer (prolonged applause).

Of course, as V. I. Lenin pointed out, the unmasking of hostile sabotage is "unpleasant" work. Vladimir Il'ich said this work was "foul" but, after all, we are not afraid of dirty work, and it simply not permissable not to unmask these ideological intrigues for communists.

Soviet artistic activists do not hold defensive positions in the hand-to-hand combat ofideas; they are fighters of the attacking class.

The party does show writers how to write, which kinds of artistic means and genres to use. This is a matter of professional mastery, a matter of talent. But the party, as was emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress, has not been and can not be indifferent to the ideological direction of art. The union of writers, its press agencies, and above all, its party organizations must always take a clear cut, principled position in these matters. There can be no compromises when there are manifestations of apolitical, philosophical limitedness, attempts to cast a shadow on Soviet reality and to denigrate the worth of the Soviet man. In such cases, as L. I. Brezhnev noted, it is necessary "to be able to direct those who move to one side or another."

At one time the Union of Ukrainian Writers and its party organizations conducted the necessary educational work with individual writers who had made mistakes. And today their talents honorably serve the people.

An active vital position is typical of the absolute majority of modern masters of the artistic word. This is primarily to the credit of party organizations of the union of writers which join together more than two-thirds of the writers of the republic. And in the future each party organization of the creative union, emphasized Comrade V. V. Shcherbitskiy, should be a cardinal vital spirit of the collective of activists of art, a true center of ideological and educational work.

Communist writers, like all literary activists, are not only deprived of the "right," as it were, to write in a mediocre way, but are called upon to set the tone in literary life, to bring into the mainstream of life. And, undoubtedly, they should be models of high party discipline and adherence to principle for all writers' organizations.

I should like to draw the personal attention of our respected writers of the older generation who have benefited by experience to their moral-political and party responsibility for the creation of a friendly and creative atmosphere in the literary environment.

As we know, a literary work lies at the basis of many kinds of art. And, of course, the participation of talented writers in the creation of movie scenarios and stage performances, and in the proliferation of songs that glorify the Ukraine is not only desirable; it is simply necessary. One can not farm this important work out to hacks as, unfortunately, is still sometimes the case. There is also no doubt that the Ministry of Culture, the State Committee for Publishing Houses and Printing, the State Committee for Cinematography, and the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting of the Ukrainian SSR should find more effective forms of cooperation between writers and other activists of art.

I should also like to draw the attention of the union of writers and its party organizations to the need for a deeper study and more extensive utilization of everything that is new and valuable which is manifested in the work of creative unions of the sister republics. I am speaking particularly about the rich experience in conducting literary and artistic holidays that was gained in the Russian Federation, about the practice of working with young writers in Georgia, about the experience of Belorussian writers in providing party education for the workers, and so forth.

The education of upcoming artists is also our general concern. It is the honored civic duty of experienced masters of the artistic word to do everything necessary so that the young generation will continue and enrich the Leninist traditions of our literature. It is understandable that the education of younger talent is a difficult and complicated matter. It requires tact, demandingness and professional competence, and the main thing, attention and patience, the good spirit of a mentor.

The Union of Writers, the Central Committee of the Lenin Young Communist League of the Ukraine, and the Ukrainian SSR State Committee for Publishing Houses and Printing should be especially concerned about publishing the works of young authors.

And in conclusion, another question which is last but certainly not least in importance. There is no secret about the important role of literary criticism in the complex and responsible work for educating young writers and in the development of all literature. Of course, in recent years much has been done to activate critical thought and provide an objective orientation for both writers and readers. But still, when it is needed we do not always hear with full force the authoritative, demanding and at the same time friendly words of literary critics. If one recalls the fact that every tenth member of the Union of Ukrainian Writers is a critic, we have every reason to expect that the quantity here will soon be turned into quality (applause).

Worthy comrades! At the 26th CPSU Congress Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev said: "To live in the interests of the people, to share joy and sorrow with them, to confirm the truth of life and our humanitarian ideals, to be an active participant in communist construction--herein lies the true spirit of the people and the true spirit of the party in art." We are convinced that these words of Leonid Il'ich will be accepted by the delegates to this conference and all writers and all activists of art in the Soviet Ukraine as a definitive line for our creativity (turbulent applause).

With all my heart I wish you, dear comrades, good health and more creative achievements for the good of our Soviet people, to the glory of our great socialist homeland (turbulent prolonged applause).

Problems Highlighted

Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 9 Apr 81 pp 1-3

[Excerpts] "To live in the interests of the people, to share joy and sorrow with them, to affirm the truth of life and our humanitarian ideals, to be an active participant in communist construction"--these are the words of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev spoken from the tribune of the All-Union Party Forum to masters of Soviet culture. They define the main content of the businesslike conversation at the 8th Congress of Ukrainian Writers which is taking place in Kiev. Literary workers of the republic, with close solidarity around our native Communist Party, are filled with resolve always to be ideological warriors and to account to the party and the people for their creative achievements and multifaceted social activity as well as to earmark plans for the future.

Participating in the work of the congress are V. V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine; the following members of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine--A. F. Vatchenko, chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR; A. P. Lyashko, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR; V. A. Sologub, chairman of the Ukrainian trade union council; the following candidate members of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine--first secretary of the Kiev party Gorkom, Yu. N. Yel'chenko and secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, A. S. Kapto; the head of the Cultural Division of the CPSU Central Committee, V. F. Shauro; the first secretary of the board of the USSR Writers' Union, G. M. Markov; deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers, M. A. Orlik, and guests from Moscow, Leningrad and sister republics.

Opening the congress, Hero of Socialist Labor, poet and academician Mikola Bazhan emphasized that writers of the Soviet Ukraine had gathered at a remarkable time. A month ago the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union completed its glorious work. Its mighty influence on the life of the entire planet becomes more profound every day, for all peace-loving, honorable and thinking people see the paths earmarked by the congress as the only true and correct ones toward the triumph of peace, reason, justice and progress, paths toward a happy, creative future.

V. V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, spoke at the congress and warmly welcomed those in attendance.

The congress is beginning to consider the first question on the agenda--the report of the board of the Union of Ukrainian Writers.

The first secretary of the board of the Union of Ukrainian Writers, winner of the USSR State Prize, Pavlo Zagrebel'nyy, gave a talk entitled "Literature as a Measure of the Time and Greatness of Man."

On behalf of the delegates of the congress, the speaker expressed his deep and sincere gratitude to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine and to Vladimir Vasil'yevich Shcherbitskiy personally for their words of greeting and their high party confidence in the creative labor of the writers as well as their great hope and belief in a new flourishing of Ukrainian soviet literature.

It was emphasized in the talk that the 26th CPSU Congress has become the highest event, crowning the great campaign of the Soviet people to the heights of material and spiritual well-being, its struggle for peace and happiness on earth. The Soviet writers expressed their heartfelt gratitude to Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev for the high evaluation he gave to their labor and to their participation in socialist construction: ". . .a new tidal wave is rising in Soviet art. In recent years--and in all republics--there have been many works of talent," said L. I. Brezhnev. "This pertains to literature and the theater, cinema and music, painting and sculpture . . . These works have various heroes--a leader of a construction brigade and a kolkhoz chairman, a railroad worker and an officer, a pilot and an eminent scientist. In each of them the readers and viewers find agreement with their own thoughts and experiences and see the embodiment of the best features of the Soviet character."

At the center of the literature of socialist realism it is man, his spiritual honor and worth--a problem which is now growing into the issue of the very existence of mankind. Literature is a monument to the people and a chronicle of their struggle, action and growth; it is also a manifestation of national life in all of its complexity and at the same time one of the most intensive and rich forms of life. Complacency is not a part of real literature. In exactly the same way it should also be alien to us when we gather together to sum up the results of our work during the period that has transpired between the two writers' congresses.

In recent years, continued the speaker, readers of the republic have received hundreds of new books from Ukrainian writers. On them are the names of both well known authors and young ones. As in all soviet literature of the 1970's, the leading genre in Ukrainian literature is prose which, because of the qualitatively new level, has brought the novel to its zenith. In all of its diversity it embraces all the main thematic areas--revolution, images of Marx, Engels and Lenin, empassioned revolutionaries, the heroic history of our homeland, the Great Patriotic War, and our contemporaries. Above all we can mention here the novels of Oles' Gonchar: Cyclone, Brigantine, The Shore of Love and Your Dawn. These are the peak achievements not only of Ukrainian, but also of all soviet literature, and they represent a unique orientation point, summoning us to creative competition, courage and daring. Our literature has been enriched during this period by two large novels of Mikhail Stel'makh, Thought About You and Four Fords, in which one again feels the hand of a master, the writing of a master. The dialogue of Vasiliy Zemlyak, A Flock of Swans and Green Mills was an unusual phenomenon in our literature. It was filled with great love for our land and the people who live on it. Yuriy Mushketik worked fairly fruitfully and productively. It is no accident that his novel, Position, was awarded the Shevchenko Prize and was successful among readers throughout the union.

A typical sign of our literary life is the entry of women into novel writing. The books of M. Malinovskaya, N. Bichuya, L. Kopan', V. Vrublovskaya, N. Krakhmaleva, M. Glushko, V. Yermolova, N. Kashchuk, A. Tytuyunnik and E. Basariya reflect the

critical nature of problems that are raised, keen observation and a poetic perception of the world which is refined by style.

One must say directly that the education and the cultural level of the Soviet man have increased immeasurably and a kind of "cultural-educational" explosion has taken place--hence the colossal popularity of the book. But is it not a shame that, against the background of this popularity, certain editions stand on the shelves of bookstores covered with dust. How is this explained? By the fact that the reader is not interested in books that do not deal with problems and are not poetic, books which are not art but only counterfeits of art. There are still a few works in modern Ukrainian prose to which it would be appropriate to apply the words of L. I. Brezhnev from the accountability report at the 26th party congress: in them ". . . they have raised serious problems of the kind that the Gosplan should 'sweat over'." A considerable part of our prose loses ground not so much because of the level of artistry as because of the inadequately bold handling of problems, the desire to avoid the critical corners of life, the reluctance to raise the most complex problems. Literature should listen to time, should celebrate the greatness and stalwartness of man--only then will it earn love and respect.

The number of poets in our union has increased in recent years. But in poetry just as in prose and in other genres we again find quality in the works of well-known masters. We recall the name of Mikola Bazhan, with elements of romantic musicality bursting violently into the lines of his verses; Platon Voron'ko who is now giving himself over to philosophy and recollections, and reveals the inexhaustible spiritual reserves of feelings; Dmitriy Pavlychko who throws himself into the maelstrom of love lyric and gives us the book, "The Mystery of the Face," and Lina Kostenko who revealed new facets of her talent in the novel in verse entitled Marusya Churay. A poetic search is conducted in the books of I. Drach, S. Yovenko, V. Brovchenko, N. Nagnibeda, L. Dmiterko, V. Kolomiyets, L. Bysheslavskiy, I Ryadchenko, A. Kravchenko, N. Rybalko, B. Paliychuk and V. Glotov. The creative work of Boris Oleynik has found well-deserved popularity among the readers. He is a representative of the generation which, in our eyes, became masters, taking the relay baton from the hands of the founders of Ukrainian Soviet poetry and worthily carrying it further. Poetry is one of the main features of man, of his consciousness, of his imagination and of his perception of the world. And therefore a real poet must be not only a singer of high feelings, a master of poetic technique and improviser, but also a tribune, a fighter, an agitator. The younger generation should recall this.

A high spirit of public commentary, defense of high ideals, and struggle against inertia and depression have always been the goal of Ukrainian literature. We have received a rich heritage, developed it, and sharpened its publicistic weapon in the ideological battles of the 20th century, in the battles for the principles of October, for the great Leninist teachings, and against the servants of imperialism, chauvinism, nationalism, Zionism and racism. Working actively in this difficult and responsible genre today are N. Podolyan who deservedly won the Shevchenko Prize, T. Migal', who fights indefatigably against the sworn enemies of the Ukrainian soviet people--the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, B. Kotlyarov, P. Avtomonov, I. Tsyupa, V. Sokolov, B. Silayev, V. Petlevanyy and many other public commentators. Standing out brilliantly among them is the talent of V. Korotich whose publicistic activity was highly celebrated this year when he was awarded the State Prize of the Ukrainian SSR imeni T. G. Shevchenko. There is not a single .e of our experienced

literary men who does not in one way or another appear in the press, on radio or on television as a publicist. Unfortunately we do not see an attraction to this on the part of newly accepted members of the union. Why do they not follow the example of, say, F. T. Morgun who, despite how busy he is, for many years has been developing the theme "Man and Bread," or A. Il'chenko who has been consistently fighting for the implementation of interesting ideas regarding improving the fertility of the land, or K. Gordiyenko who all his life has written about rural workers.

Analyzing the condition of dramaturgy, the speaker emphasized that it has begun to discover new scenes and crucial new problems. Even with the strong competition from movies and television Ukrainian dramaturgists have reached a point where today people do not simply go to the theater, but ask for extra tickets. The current successes of Ukrainian Soviet dramaturgy are related above all to the names of the winner of the USSR State Prize and State Prize of the Ukrainian SSR imeni T. G. Shevchenko, Oleska Kolomiyts and winner of the State Prize of the Ukrainian SSR imeni T. G. Shevchenko, Mikola Zadurnyy. Thanks to their great creative achievements Ukrainian dramaturgy has overcome a temporary lag, has entered into broad expanses, and has become a significant phenomenon in the union-wide literary process. Our theaters are glad to present the plays of I. Rachada, Yu. Mokriyev, A. Pidsukhi and Yu. Shcherbak who are young authors but they are willing to experiment and search creatively, choosing paths that have been marked out.

The atmosphere has been more favorable than ever before for the development of criticism, which is shown by the decree of the CPSU Central Committee, "On the Development of Literary and Artistic Criticism." Today, the speaker said, we can speak of a new critical wave, of the entry of capable young literary men into this important area, of a number of interesting publications among which the research of L. Novichenko, "The Poetic World of Maksim Ryl'skiy," stands out, and about the participation of critics in the literary process. After this reawakening, the shortcomings also became more noticeable. In striving to be all-embracing, current criticism has turned to simple statement, lists have begun to prevail in articles and reviews, and there appeared the threat of homogeneity. This has happened in several works which criticism has smoothed over, like a pebble on a beach, no longer being concerned about depth of analysis, but about searching for high-flown epithets and impressive titles. Yet entire sections of literature are actually still forgotten. For example: short stories, satire, humor, children's and youth literature. We are concerned about the fact that our children no longer receive enough valuable artistic work which could be a guiding light for them in their lives. There are not enough new readings of our Soviet classics, criticism is not interested in the personality of the writer, and it does not take into account the editorial policy and the theater life of the republic. There are still not very many books that present impassioned words about Ukrainian literature and its position in the concert of world literatures, pointed and aggresive books which would play an important role in the ideological battles of modernity.

Man's spiritual wealth and social value in life and literature are determined primarily by his attitude toward labor. And although in our prose devoted to the working class we still mention the inadequate penetration into the social depths of life, simplistic exposition and the stereotypicality of situations, at the same time we say that the conflicts we've resolved on the production plane are somewhat overshadowed by the conflicts whose solution takes place on the moral and ethical

plane. More and more space is devoted to thoughts about man and his ties in the collective, and the understanding of the nature of the Soviet worker has become significantly richer, a nature which was formed under the conditions of a socialist society. This has contributed to a situation where in the best works this theme has included questions of the emergence of the individual in an age of scientific and technical revolution, the deepening of the humanistic basis and more truthful disclosure of man in the collective. True, in novels, especially on the theme of the worker, the depictions are still "engineered," and also in works about scientific workers we very frequently encounter pseudoproblematics and overloading with information.

Novelists have rewarded their readers with many interesting books. They are continuing the noble tradition of Ukrainian prose and considering questions of rural areas in the context of crucial problems of our society. Deepening the philosophical and socio-historical analysis of the age, Ukrainian prose writers are trying to link modernity to the past, the vital socio-ethical problems of today with events of the Great Patriotic War, collectivization, the revolution and earlier history.

Returning to the subject of continuity in the Ukrainian Soviet poetry, B. Oleynik emphasized that there are not many modern literatures in which five generations have been able to work shoulder to shoulder--from the founders to those who are just publishing their first collections. He gave the names of those who had laid the foundations of the palace of new Soviet literature and poets of the younger generation, the best of whom can enter into creative competition in the union-wide literary field. It is gratifying that in a time of the establishment of Ukrainian Soviet poetry poets of various nationalities are working in the ranks of the writers. The speaker emphasized the high professional level and the bold entry into life of representatives of the poetic shop who have armed themselves with humor and satire. Ukrainian epic poetry has attained true maturity which makes it possible to occupy a leading position in the union-wide arena.

A co-report about the new goals of Ukrainian dramaturgy was given by the secretary of the board of the Union of Ukrainian Writers, winner of the State Prize of the Ukrainian SSR imeni T. G. Shevchenko, Aleksandr Levada.

Since the very first years of its emergence Ukrainian Soviet dramaturgy has always been imbued with revolutionary pathos, popular spirit, and communist party spirit. This glorious tradition is living, flourishing and developing today as well. This does not mean, of course, that the dramaturgists have no duties to the public on the ideological and political plane. They do, and it is quite appreciable. Our turbulent times and the entire totality of extremely complicated circumstances of public and political life in our country and throughout the world require that writers be considerably more active in their creativity, above all in the creation of purely political plays regarding the most important political problems that disturb our people and all mankind. There is an especially clear-cut need to create plays on militant themes of international life that are directed toward unmasking the nuclear war mongers, imperialist plunderers and neocolonizers, fascist racists, and bloodthirsty apostate-hegemonists; plays which would confirm the heroism of the struggle for peace and socialism, for the real rights of man, for high communist humanity.

in the co-report much attention was devoted to problems of increasing the professional mastery and developing dramaturgy for children and youth, the interconnections between the authors and the theaters, the diversity of genres of dramatic literature and more effective criticism.

Yuriy Zbanatskiy, secretary of the board of the Union of Ukrainian Writers, winner of the State Prize of the Ukrainian SSR imeni T. G. Shevchenko, noted in his co-report about literature for children and youth that the formation, training and education of the new man have constituted one of the most important issues in human activity throughout all preceding epochs, and in our time it is one of the most pressing and complex ones. The Soviet society is the first in the history of mankind to raise its younger generation for creative labor, good and joy, to educate them to be spiritually rich, in the ideals of social justice, peace and humanism. Artistic literature has a great mission in this noble cause. It must confirm the truth of life and our humanitarian ideals, and be an active participant in the formation of the new, harmoniously developed human personality.

Children's literature is steadily raising its ideological and artistic level, and enriching and expanding its subject matter. More writers are striving to give preschool children, pioneers and all pupils the clearest possible works of talent which would bring to the readers both our glorious past, our unrepeatable modernity and the grandeur of the future. Still one must also discuss the appreciable lack of attention to this area of our literature on the part of criticism, the appreciable lack of attention on the part of literary men to certain extremely important vital questions and problems which the writers who write for children are called upon to solve.

More than 100 books have come out in the Ukraine in the past five years--theoretical and historical-literary research, collections of articles, portraits and so forth. Their authors are representative of all generations, among whom one also hears the voice of the younger generation of the critical field. But our research has devoted considerably less attention to theoretical problems of socialist realism, the principles of party and popular spirit, and concepts of humanism in the modern stage, and it has not adequately developed themes related to the various aspects of the socialist way of life, above all socio-psychological ones. It is no accident that certain works that are marked by a clear lack of ideological and artistic content, particularly certain samples of semi-hack historical fiction, have either been ignored or have been expressly criticized. Hence a task that is clear for everyone--all-around increased concern for raising the theoretical and methodological level and the adherence to ideological principles in criticism.

On 8 April delegates to the conference heard a report from the chairman of the inspection commission of the Union of Ukrainian Writers, Ivan Gocharenko.

They began to discuss the reports and co-reports.

The congress is continuing its work today.

11772
CSO: 1800/379

END

END OF FICHE DATE FILMED

5/20/81